

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

DEC 5 1952

FINE ARTS
READING ROOM

C

A

COLLEGE ART JOURNAL

J

SUMMER
1952

volume XI, Number 4

Editor: LAURENCE SCHMECKEBIER, Cleveland Institute of Art, 11441 Juniper Rd., Cleveland 6, Ohio. *Editor for Book Reviews:* ALLEN S. WELLER, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. *News Editor:* VIRGINIA WORLEY, 312-318 Genesee St., Utica 4, N.Y.

THE COLLEGE ART JOURNAL is published quarterly by the College Art Association of America at 625 Madison Ave., New York 22, N.Y. Two dollars a year; single nos. fifty cents. Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office in New York, N.Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry at Menasha, Wis. Printed in U.S.A.

CONTENTS

A-Hunt

Archit

Progre

(Fr

Remar

The C

The U

Conce

(C.

The P

Monor

Conte

Obitu

News

Book

Volu

A I

College Art Journal

CONTENTS	PAGE
A-Humanism, Primitivism, and the Art of the Future (<i>Alan Gowans</i>)	226
Architecture and Modern Art (<i>Winston Weisman and Seymour Fogel</i>)	240
Progressive Education, Creative Expression and Art Appreciation (<i>Frederick M. Logan</i>)	245
Remarks on the Problem of Form (<i>Adolf Hildebrand</i>)	251
The College and Adult Education (<i>Peter Fingesten</i>)	258
The Utilitarian Fallacy in Art Training (<i>Peter Kahn</i>)	261
Concerning Young Hopefuls Who Would Like to Become Artists (<i>C. A. Laely</i>)	265
The Prophet and the Playboy or "Dada Was Not a Farce" (<i>John Alford</i>)	269
Monographs in Slides (<i>Ulrich Middeldorf</i>)	277
Contemporary Documents—American Sculpture 1951	280
Obituaries	290
News Reports	291
Book Reviews	296

Volume XI

SUMMER, 1952

Number 4

A PUBLICATION OF THE COLLEGE ART ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

N
1
.C7

A-HUMANISM, PRIMITIVISM, AND THE ART OF THE FUTURE

Alan Gowans

IN THE words of Sidney Janis, artists today are engaged "in the process of creating the visual counterpart of the anatomy and structure and inner spirit of the time in which they live . . . the new realities of the twentieth century."¹ That is a commonplace; a conscious or unconscious assumption that certain things are Real, and certain others are not, provides a framework of reference within which all thought processes are carried out—and one of these thought processes is the creation of Art. Hardly a new idea, then; but to judge from the characteristic productions of our time, the new realities of twentieth-century art involve some propositions vastly different from the older traditions of the West. "In the early days of cubism, Picasso and I were engaged in what we felt was a search for the anonymous personality. We were inclined to efface our own personalities in order to find originality."² And of this Picasso, an early and perceptive critic wrote, "How he does hate the human race! How he enjoys pushing its face!"³ No isolated sentiments these, but very typical; and no mere sensationalism, which so negates the value of the individual personality, and of Man in general as superior to other material or immaterial forms—a negation which, for want of a better term, we might call a-humanism, the Abolition of Man.⁴

A-humanism is not the only trend in present-day art, of course, but it is prominent enough to color much of it, particularly the kind of art thought of by most laymen as "modern"; what they are objecting to when they say modern art is unintelligible to "normal people"—i.e., themselves—is its a-humanistic element. The layman senses that his face is being pushed, and, being human, he doesn't like it. But the New Reality which produces among other things "modern" art and the kind of a-humanism which informs so

¹ *Abstract and Surrealist Art in America*, New York, 1944, p. 1. In the writing of this paper, I am much indebted to Professor Donald D. Egbert of Princeton University for sympathetic advice and encouragement. Opinions expressed are, of course, the writer's own.

² George Braque, quoted by Janis, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

³ Quoted by Frances B. Blanshard, *Retreat from Likeness in the Theory of Painting*, New York, 1945, p. 73.

⁴ Cf. the short book by this title of C. S. Lewis, New York, 1947.

much of it, is not "modern." Nor is it transient. It has been with us for a long time, so long, in fact, that we have a good historical perspective on its manifestations, and its end result in art may be discerned with some sureness.

Modern Reality first began to appear with Paul Cézanne, the self-confessed and universally acknowledged "primitive of a new art."⁵ Cézanne was very conscious of what he was doing; in this respect he was a typical modern: "Painting has one task only, to produce a picture of Reality." But the Reality of modern art is not too easily definable, either in words or paint; Cézanne himself doubted that he ever fully realized what he had in mind, seeing himself rather as a beginner, breaking paths for others to follow. The fact that the modern concept of Reality has been in a continuous process of evolution has led some critics to speak of the "realities" of modern art, as if there were more than one concept involved. But it is the process of evolution which gives this semblance of multiplicity; at any given time there have been many artists working at various stages of the development.

The new concept first appears with a superficial resemblance to mediaeval forms of art. That is to say, at the beginning of the modern era—say around 1875—there is a rejection of the Renaissance idea that Reality is basically to be sought in the world about man, in externals, whether copied exactly, eclecticized, or generalized;⁶ just so the similar Graeco-Roman classical concept was rejected by early Christian artists. Certainly Cézanne's life, and the art which he dedicated to the new Reality, is reminiscent enough of mediaeval man. He keeps himself "unspotted from the world" which "does not understand me, as I do not understand the world; that is why I have withdrawn from it." In solitary retreat at Aix-en-Provence, Cézanne sought to find an artistic vehicle for a concept of Reality which would probably find its closest formulation in the writings of Plotinus. "Nature . . . , the spectacle which the *Pater Omnipotens aeterne Deus* spreads before our eyes" was to Cézanne "the true and immense study to be undertaken"; behind nature, he sought intuitively to recognize the true unchanging Real. It resembles the

⁵ These and the following quotations are from Bernard Dorival, *Cézanne*, New York and Paris, 1948, pp. 75ff.

⁶ Cf. the discussion by Blanshard, *op. cit.* She demonstrates that in basic point of departure there is no difference between the direct copying of nature, and the making of a "composite image" on the basis of eclectic selection from nature. Plato might seem the exception, in that he believed the external ideas which constitute Reality were not deducible from external forms. But it is significant for the attitude of the classical-Renaissance tradition that the only art Plato knows he condemns, precisely because he believes it based upon external realities; and the art Plato knew was what we call "classical."

mediaeval and Christian concept of Reality, and Cézanne tried to believe it was the same thing. All his life, Cézanne was nominally a Christian, and more: "He was . . . more than an ordinary church-goer; he had a truly religious and mystical soul . . . Christianity could therefore raise him to the absolute, but painting did so too. . . ." Like the mediaeval man, in dealing with the human figure Cézanne sought to abstract from it everything unreal and transitory, belonging to the world of impressionistic sense. His solid block forms are intended to strip Man to his essence, to make of him an image of eternal Reality in a temporal world.

Towards the end of his life, Cézanne began to express doubts whether he ever had succeeded in realizing this concept, or ever would. He was even less certain of the ability of his self-styled "followers" to succeed. "If they organize my triumph, do not believe in it; if they try to create a school in my name, tell them they have never understood me, nor cared what I have done." And he was justified. For while the work of Picasso, let us say, may claim a formal kinship with Cézanne, its spirit is markedly different. In Cézanne there is no a-humanism. Cézanne believed that man, and the world he lived in, had permanent value, and he respected it. He sought to express this permanence in a world of change. Not so his followers. Their characteristic expression was in a dynamic and shifting balance of lines and shapes, the essence of impermanence. It is not Cézanne's Reality, nor any variant of the mediaeval, eternal Real, that underlies their works. Modern Reality may have begun with Cézanne, but it developed rapidly along lines he never envisaged.

The "cubist" art of Cézanne's followers has been fairly described as hybrid in character. On one side it derives from Cézanne, but on the other it rooted in Science.⁷ Most of the *avant-garde* movements in modern art since have been equally hybrid, but Science has come more and more to dominate them.⁸ If we find a different spirit in modern art from Cézanne or the older traditions, and an a-humanistic element, it is Science that must provide the explanation.

The scientific outlook which stamps modern art is as modern as the art

⁷ "If the cosmologies of Eddington and Jeans are hybrids of Einstein and Plato, the images of the Cubists and Constructivists are hybrids of popular science and Cézanne." John Alford, "A Century of Sculpture," *Museum Notes* (Rhode Island School of Design, Providence), VII, No. 5. I want to thank Professor Alford for his kind and constructive criticism of an earlier version of this paper.

⁸ So, e.g., "If you wish to reduce Surrealism to its foundations you will find the only basic elements on which any useful structure can be built—the basic elements of natural science and psychology (sic?)." Herbert Read (ed.), *Surrealism*, New York, 1937, pp. 37-38.

itself; indeed, they have grown up together, as we might expect. There is as great a difference between modern and Renaissance science as between modern and Renaissance art. No longer the solid, static forms of Newtonian physics, but the complex dynamic forces of Einstein's Relativity. No longer the immutable organisms created by the hand of God for all eternity, but the constant evolutionary change of Darwinian biology. No longer a compartmentalized and divisible time, but the continuous Becoming postulated by Bergson. No longer a society in which each man and class has his appointed place, but the shifting, dialectical class struggle urged by Marx. Modern science, then, sees Reality as a process, as a constant working-out, a becoming: "Not merely the organic world, not merely this earth we live on, but the whole universe is undergoing a process of continuous change."⁹ So the New Reality of science, and the New Art is built on it.

Through the continual explorations, through the plethora of new movements, we see modern art groping to embody a Reality of change and process. *Collage* painting and mobile sculpture, Vorticism and Futurism, they all work to this end: "An automobile at full speed is more beautiful than the Victory of Samothrace. War is the culminating and perfect synthesis of progress; it is equal to aggressive velocity plus violent simplifications of effort. . . ."¹⁰ Movement and change—the Reality of Process.

The superficiality of any resemblance between mediaeval and modern art is clearly apparent on this basic level. Both concepts of the Real are immaterial; therefore both kinds of art will be fundamentally symbolic and non-naturalistic. Natural appearances will be "distorted" so that the true character of Reality will not be confused. Therefore there will be a superficial similarity of forms, both being non-naturalistic. But in intent and spirit, nothing could be further apart than mediaeval and modern art, because nothing could be further apart than the concepts of Reality which underlie them.

For the mediaeval man, Reality—i.e., God—was external to himself, and completely outside of his control. It was also permanent. But for the modern, exactly the opposite. Richard Guggenheimer, in an apt passage, has summed up the case for the modern. "If we wish to be creative, either as artist or audience, it is necessary to explore the contemporary institutions concerning our existence, its form, meaning, and beauty. More than ever before, we find the qualities of that existence related to the quality of the beholding mind. We

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

¹⁰ Manifesto by Marinetti, published in *Figaro*, February 20, 1909, quoted by Rosa Trillo Clough, *Looking Back at Futurism*, New York, 1942.

find scientific explanations more and more dependent upon the construction of our mental concepts. . . . Einstein's concepts of relativity, the 'statistics' theory of atomic contingency, and the genetic assumptions that future developments of living things are forecast in the genes before the creature itself exists have all arisen from, and given rise to new thinking procedures. These developments . . . lead contemporary physicists and biochemists to assert that 'the laws of physics are made by man' and the 'province of the physical is not the study of the external world, but the study of a portion of the inner world of experience.'¹¹

George Orwell summed up the problem succinctly in his study of the New Reality which he cast in the form of a novel entitled *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: "I tell you . . . that reality is not external. Reality exists in the human mind, and nowhere else. . . . The world is as old as we are, no older. How could it be older? Nothing exists except through human consciousness. . . . Before man, there was nothing. After man, if he could come to an end, there would be nothing. Outside of man there is nothing."¹² Between this concept of an internal, forever changeable Reality, and the mediaeval external, changeless Real, there can be no point of contact. Nor can there be any point of contact between Man as conceived by modern and mediaeval thought.

Mediaeval man derived his worth from a unique relationship with God, the ultimate Reality. Man was made in God's image; he partook, therefore, of the divine permanence, the divine Reality. The individual personality was therefore sacred and of imperishable worth. But modern science teaches that outside of man there is nothing Real, nothing permanent. All that man is, all the worth that the individual possesses, must derive from himself alone. And what intrinsic value does modern science see in the individual? Only that which is shared with all nature—his mechanistic, animal, material qualities. If the individual has value, it is only as he is part of Humanity. And Humanity is a vague and abstract conception which means little. Man, then, means little. An art based on this Reality then ultimately can mean little; it can appeal only to brute sensation—a red cloth waved before a bull. It is a-humanism, in contrast to supra-humanism; it is a mobile compared to Chartres: "If artistic effort consists of sensory stimulation, there can be no

¹¹ Richard Guggenheimer, *Creative Vision*, New York, 1950, pp. 10-11.

¹² Eric Blair—"George Orwell" is a pen-name—described himself as a non-Communist Marxist. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (New York, 1949) represents the culmination of twenty years of thought, traceable step by step through earlier works, on the character and significance of the New Reality inherent in scientific materialism. For this reason, although art is nowhere specifically treated, I have not hesitated to quote from his last novel.

experience of the spirit. If it does not extend beyond the ganglia of the nervous system, we cannot identify motor reaction with emotion; if it insists on dissecting experience into isolated acts of sensation, there can be no universal significance attached to it. . . . It is evident that we are no longer living in the Middle Ages, nor being offered anything that looks like mediaeval art."¹³ We are, in short, having our faces pushed.

The a-humanism of modern art cannot be explained from anything in the mediaeval tradition. But the concept of the Real from which it springs suggests another and somewhat unexpected source. That is in the classical, Renaissance, tradition. For the classical concept of Reality lies midway between the mediaeval and modern. The mediaeval man saw Reality as external to himself, and permanent. Classical man agreed that Reality was external to himself—but, significantly, he believed that it was alterable, that he could control it. The modern concept has grown directly out of this latter fact.

Modern Realism appeared only fleetingly in the world of Graeco-Roman antiquity. Classical man here sensed briefly that if he could control the external world, he was also controlling the Real, and hence that he could make or unmake Reality at will. But only for a brief moment; for various reasons—chiefly technical—the natural, external world was never truly conquered by Graeco-Roman man. He succeeded only imperfectly in forcing the physical world to conform to his will; the failure of Graeco-Roman artists to capture nature in exact perspective demonstrates how far their ideal was unrealized. But in the Renaissance, from Leonardo through Jefferson to the mature Industrial Revolution, reborn classical man celebrated an unbroken, ever-increasing series of triumphs over nature. He enshrined his successive triumphs in art, from the discovery of the exact laws of perspective down to the complete capturing of natural appearances with the camera. And by the later nineteenth century, man no longer seemed confronted by a hostile and unchanging nature. Rather, he saw before him a world which he believed he could control absolutely. It was only a matter of time until Science delivered the external world—Reality—unconditionally into his hands. And precisely at this point, the New Reality begins, and modern art is born.

At this point, too, classical Reality and the classical tradition of art comes to an end. The New Reality had destroyed the mediaeval tradition (to its own satisfaction) somewhat earlier. Already in the late eighteenth century it was said that if there were no God, man would have to invent one—implying that mediaeval Reality, too, was only a creation of men's

¹³ C. R. Morey, "A Mediaevalist looks at Modern Art," originally read as a paper at Oberlin College, Ohio, later published in *Arti Figurative*, II, 1946, p. 60f.

minds. At this time, materialists like the Jeffersonians were still protected from the consequences of their own triumphs by a lingering, ever vaguer sense of some external Reality, and the statement, "Men are endowed by their Creator with . . . rights" still made sense.¹⁴ But given the further progress of nineteenth century science, the final formulation was inevitable: "Men endow themselves with rights." Or as Marx phrased it: "The ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought."¹⁵ There was no longer any external Reality, nor any facts that were self-evident.

From this development stems the dilemma of Paul Cézanne. Cézanne was trying to embody a mediaeval kind of external, changeless Reality in his art. But he worked with the approach of the classical mind—seeking, by his own powers, to extract this essence from nature, to dominate it himself. He expected the Reality which he found to be self-evident, and was disappointed to find it was not, that he was not honored among men. For the Reality that he discovered was his own creation. His own mind made it, and it was no more valid, or valued, than the world created by the mind of Vincent Van Gogh, for example—the contemporary Cézanne disliked so much. Despite himself, it was the New Reality that informed Cézanne's art, not the mediaeval Real.

Art demonstrates in a particularly apt way the catalytic role played by Renaissance thought in the change from an external, permanent Reality to an internal, fluid conception. For it was the theoreticians of the Renaissance who first dared to claim that Man—as embodied in what they considered the highest type, the artist—could absolutely control the external world. "If the painter wishes to see beauties that charm him, it lies in his power to create them; and if he wishes to see monstrosities that are frightful . . . he can be lord and God (creator) thereof. . . . In fact, whatever exists in the universe, in essence, in appearance, in the imagination, the painter has first in his mind and then in his hands."¹⁶ So Leonardo. Three centuries later, Schiller expounds the same theme: "The dignity of mankind is laid in thy hands . . .";

¹⁴ Cf. Daniel J. Boorstin, *The Lost World of Thomas Jefferson*, New York, 1948, esp. pp. 243-248.

¹⁵ "To Hegel, the life-process of the human brain, i.e., the process of thinking, which, under the name of "The Idea" he even transforms into an independent subject, is the demiurgos of the real world, and the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of "The Idea." With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought." *Das Kapital*, preface to the first edition.

¹⁶ *Paragone* (Irma A. Richter, ed.), New York, 1949.

the artist is like a king "living on the summits of mankind."¹⁷ In less poetic vein, the prospectus of the Chicago Institute of Design gives the modern artist's viewpoint: "Through the experimental approach toward handling tools and materials, we are able to increase and refine our native ability to react to and to control the physical environment in which we live. . . . The effective control of the physical environment is the designer's task. . . . The Institute's Foundation Course . . . attempts to show the student the power that rests within himself."¹⁸

The New Reality, then, grows directly out of the Reality of the classical tradition; this is its origin, but its character, and the value it places on the individual personality, is radically different. For to believe today that Reality is external, or that the individual's concept of Reality counts for anything, is "to be a lunatic, a minority of one. Only the disciplined mind can see Reality. . . . You believe that reality is something objective, external, existing in its own right. You also believe that the nature of reality is self-evident. When you delude yourself into thinking that you see something, you assume that everyone else sees the same thing as you. But I tell you . . . reality is not external."¹⁹ The individual personality, and the individual mind is valueless in determining the New Reality. A-humanism is basic to it.

We now see the nature of the Reality underlying modern art, and its resultant a-humanism. We can also see its origin, not in the mediaeval tradition which its forms superficially resemble, but in the classical tradition which it so despises. There remains to be considered why modern artists have reviled the classical tradition, and what the future of the New Reality and the new art may be. These two questions are bound up together.

It must be evident, to begin with, that no art and no society could exist on the basis of the New Reality carried to its ultimate lengths. "The idea of a meaningless, self-contained and self-justifying creation, absolutely unrelated to the normal concepts of shapes familiar to our experience"²⁰ must result in futility. Nothing coherent is possible in such a state. The solution has long since been apparent—in the quotation above it is already there. It is Discipline. On the welter of individual solipsism, on the mass of individuals each creating his own Reality and his own art from it, discipline must be

¹⁷ Quoted by Nikolaus Pevsner, *Pioneers of the Modern Movement*, London, 1936, Ch. I.

¹⁸ Prospectus for 1948-1949, p. 6.

¹⁹ Orwell, *op. cit.*

²⁰ Georges Lemaitre, *From Cubism to Surrealism in French Literature*, Cambridge, Mass., 1941, p. 213.

imposed. Perhaps, in order to arrive at a state where discipline will be willingly accepted, society must degenerate into a state of barbarism—of this more later. But one thing is certain—discipline will be imposed from above. It always has been, and always will be. For this we have a wealth of historical perspective.

We do not even need to go into history to demonstrate how this disciplined concept of Reality—this collective solipsism, if you like—will come into being. Every one of us is shaped by it. For the infant's knowledge of Reality is of this modern kind; hence the modern's interest in child art. The infant and child relates everything with which he comes into contact with himself; at the same time, nothing is self-evident to him. No two persons perceive the outside world in exactly the same way. But for purposes of mutual comprehension, we accept certain conventions about the nature of the world around us. These conventions are the result of collective solipsism, imposed on us as children. The child asks his parents, "Why is the grass green?" We reply, "Because it is." The question actually means, "Does everyone see grass the same color I do?" Now, we know, and the Impressionists demonstrated it to us again, that grass sometimes appears white, yellow, blue, brown; but we reply to the child, "Yes, for practical purposes, we accept the fact that grass is green." We discipline the child, we impose Reality upon him.

Similarly, in the childhood of the race, among prehistoric men and savages, the multitudinous concepts of Reality as various individuals see it are reduced to formulae which are impressed upon all. It is a necessary process if society and social intercourse are to come into being. And the art of this primitive mind is the prime vehicle by which this Reality is made comprehensible.²¹ With primitive art, we are dealing with basically the same sort of Reality as modern art—a solipsistic, transient concept—except that the primitive arts we know represent this Reality disciplined and controlled. To effect this discipline, the worth of the individual personality and the evidence of the individual mind must be suppressed. In primitive art—historically, we may say broadly all art before the classic age of Greece—we have the same sort of a-humanism that we find in modern art. It is not so self-assertive, because it has been accepted for ages; but it is the same fundamentally.

"Primitive" art has been peculiarly associated with the modern movement in art.²² The founders of modern art much admired it, and its esteem

²¹ The primitive concept of Realism is obviously not to be fully treated in a paper of this length.

²² Cf. R. J. Goldwater, *Primitivism in Modern Painting*, New York, 1938, *passim*.

has grown since, to include not only prehistoric and savage art, but the art of children and child-like "popular" or "folk" art as well. From the first, it has been evident that the appeal was not merely one of outward forms, but that there was a deeper affinity.

Running through the whole of vanguard thought in modern times has been a remarkable preoccupation, almost a fixation, with a return to a primitive state of society. A hundred examples crowd to mind—Rousseau; Gauguin in the South Seas; the ideals of the Bauhaus;²³ William Morris' dream of "barbarism once more flooding the world, that it may once again become beautiful and dramatic withal."²⁴ The idea recurs at all social levels—novels of H. G. Wells, like *The Time Machine*; Jack London's *Scarlet Plague*, prototype of endless themes of society reduced to savagery by sudden disaster;²⁵ Thurber's whimsical *The Last Flower*.²⁶

This longing for primitivism is, of course, connected with a conscious working for the destruction of current society. The "revolt" against classical—i.e., nineteenth-century academic—canons and principles in art is part of "revolutionary" modernism, just as much as "revolution" in the commoner, political, Communist sense.²⁷ Since modern society is individualistic, we may then say that we have here again a manifestation of a-humanism—hatred of the human race, longing to debase the individual personality. But this is more than a purely negative impulse. It has a positive side—it implies a deep-seated

²³ "Architects, sculptors, painters, we all must go back to handicraft!, etc." Manifesto by Walter Gropius on the occasion of the Bauhaus founding, 1919. *Die Maler am Bauhaus*, Munich, 1950, p. 5.

²⁴ Quoted by Pevsner, *op. cit.*, from J. W. Mackail, *The Life of William Morris*, 1899, I, p. 305, and II, p. 144.

²⁵ In both the major revolutionary movements of our time—Communism and Fascism—there was a strong element of the return to primitivism, the ideal primitive society being construed on the one hand as collectivist, on the other as feudal and aristocratic. Their rise coincided with a renewed interest in prehistoric and mythical catastrophes, which reduced a flourishing world to barbarism. Ignatius Donnelly's book on Atlantis was published in 1885 and several more followed shortly on the same subject. In the 1930's we had Churchward's books on the Land of Mu, and in 1950 Velikovsky's *Worlds in Collision*. All these things are innately bound up with the revived theory of the cyclical universe, in which everything happens over and over again. It is a way out for those who dislike the concept of human equality and individual freedom—for the a-humanist. If it is true that everything is predestined to happen over and over again in an endless cycle, then the a-humanist may confidently look forward to a return of primitivism and a new age of autocracy.

²⁶ In Thurber's book (New York, 1939), it is interesting to note how admirably the primitive style of drawing accords with the theme.

²⁷ "If we dared to travel without a guide, to trust to our eyes and ears and our contemporary sensibility, the result would be catastrophic," wrote Herbert Read (*Surrealism*, p. 45). So we see today. How welcome the catastrophe is depends on the degree of one's a-humanism.

longing after a certain state of society, a society in which "there will be no art, no literature, no science . . . [in the sense that these are created by individuals]. There will be no distinction between beauty and ugliness . . . [i.e., no criterion of external Reality from which to judge]. But always, . . . always there will be the intoxication of power, constantly increasing and constantly growing subtler. . . . If you want a picture of the Future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face forever."²⁸ It will be a world, in short, which those who hate the human race, who enjoy pushing its face, will welcome. And a-humanistic artists will welcome it, because only in such a world can a-humanistic art be truly at home.

Only in a primitivistic society can the New Reality of scientific materialism be expressed. For in our present society, individuals being what they are, only chaos can result. And for those whose a-humanism leads them to deride the values such a society places on the individual mind, this chaos is intolerable. They long for discipline to be imposed from above, as it was through the long ages of primitive man. And so they fervently admire the art produced by those ages, and long for a return of the conditions which created it.

The true modern, however, is not an a-humanist for nothing. He expects to gain something from the destruction of the individual personality, including his own, which will take place in the new primitive society. He will regain, among other things, usefulness. It has been evident for a long time that in our present individualistic society the modern artist cuts a rather pathetic and useless figure. The Reality of his art is not commonly recognized, to say the least. And he realizes that it never will be recognized, nor can he be anything much better than a decorator, an adornment to practical life, until society is primitivized. In that day, he will lose his individuality, but he will become useful, as was the artist through the early ages of primitivism. The servile cog in the Communist machine who designs posters of Stalin to be plastered on a wall serves a more useful function in his society than the free individual who exhibits his own conceptions of the New Reality in ours. When all society is primitivized, the artist will stand forth again, shorn of his Renaissance or mediaeval pretensions, and hardly an artist as we understand the term now, but at least useful—a tool of the Great.²⁹ The modern a-humanist, in a word, has lost his nerve. He feels, like so many intellectuals

²⁸ Orwell, *op. cit.* In a world without standards, power is its own justification.

²⁹ The philosophy of W. B. Yeats is an admirable example of the longing of the modern intellectual to be re-integrated into society at all costs. He dreamt of "an aristocratic civilization [i.e., in the primitive or Bronze Age sense] in its most completed form, every detail of life hierarchial, every great man's door crowded at dawn by petitioners, great wealth everywhere in a few men's hands, all dependent upon a few . . .

in our society, "fabulously capable of creation, but he does not know what to create."³⁰ In a primitive society, he will be told what to create. He will communicate and propagandize the Reality imposed on all individuals from above. For art will surely regain its old function of communication in the new society. Literacy is useful and feasible only in an individualistic society. As knowledge declines, picture-writing will come into its own. The artist will take his place again among the privileged elite of society—the priestly caste—who will dictate what Reality is.

Needless to say, the new art will not be modern art as we know it. Modern art represents the explorations of individuals into the realms of the New Reality. In the new primitive society, there will be neither individuals nor explorations. For those moderns who are thorough-going a-humanists, this will be a clear gain—they hate the individual personality anyway.

Very few modern artists are a-humanistic to this extent. They hope for some kind of compromise. "If we could live for many centuries under unchanging religious creeds or uniform social conditions, developing a strong style tradition with limited variants for individual fantasy—then we might eventually create works of art with the great intensity of African sculpture."³¹ It is precisely this kind of compromise which cannot be had, however. Cézanne tried to compromise with the New Reality, and failed. So it will be everywhere. If we lived for centuries in a static society, individual fantasy would be non-existent, as in the primitive societies of the past.

If the new Reality triumphs and a new primitive society is built upon it, there are two possibilities for art. One is that it will disappear altogether. To realize in art a Reality that lies in a flux, in a process, is fundamentally impossible, since the media of art are solid and material. It is the same problem that faced the early Christian artist, when he tried, in solid and material form, to represent a Reality that was spiritual. The recurrent iconoclasm in the Christian world bears witness to the depth of the problem, and we shall expect to see a similar iconoclasm in modern society; indeed, it is already evident.

However, the Christian artist solved the problem by using material forms as symbols for the non-material. The modern artist, perforce, does the same. Therefore art in the new primitive society will be profoundly symbolic. The question is, what forms will these symbols take? Again, we see the problem

and everywhere . . . an inequality made law." Quoted by George Orwell, "W. B. Yeats," *Dickens, Dali, and Others*, New York, 1946, p. 166.

³⁰ José Ortega y Gasset, *The Revolt of the Masses*, Ch. I.

³¹ Ladislav Segy, "African Sculpture and Cubism," *Gallery*, I, No. 4, p. 12.

in historical perspective, we examine the art of primitive societies.

In the beginning, primitive man, like the child, finds himself in a maze of disconnected sense impressions. Out of these, each man, insofar as he leaves the animal state of simply reacting to these impressions, and seeks to make them coherent, fashions a Reality of his own. It is a primitive kind of solipsism. And during the time when there is no organized society, solipsism is dominant—there is no commonly accepted Reality, no norm. This is imposed as a part of the process of organizing social life, and the resultant concept represents a Reality of collective solipsism. It is the bedrock upon which human comprehension of the world is founded. And in the event that present-day society should revert to the primitive, the process would have to be repeated if organized society is not to disappear. One thing is certain—art carrying a Reality so imposed would have no resemblance to modern art. The Reality of modern art is a highly sophisticated, highly individualistic thing. Both sophistication and individualism as we know it are non-existent in primitive society. The art which emerges from primitive solipsism—which embodies the collectively imposed concept of Reality—has always been remarkably close to the "self-evident" Reality which modern art rejects. When human minds have been forced to agree on a general normative concept of what the world is like, the symbols for it have always been, and always will be, rather "naturalistic." They are not related to each other in terms of linear perspective, for perspective implies the world organized from the viewpoint of an individual, which is foreign to the primitive mind. The scale is determined not by how the individual sees it, but by social significance. Similarly, the parts of complex symbols, such as a human body, are not related to each other from the individual viewpoint, but consist of various memory pictures of the parts added together arbitrarily. Nevertheless, the memory pictures themselves, the "characteristically-seen" symbols, resemble what we say the eye "self-evidently" sees—and which the camera confirms that it does see. The modern may fondly believe that his kind of Reality is the spontaneous and normal product of a mind unhampered by traditional concepts—but history, and his own children, refute him. And there is even more convincing evidence. The society today which is built upon the New Reality and which manifests the mentality of collective primitivism is Soviet Russia. In the Soviet state, modern art, the "infantile disorder of leftism," was suppressed at the beginning of the New Order, and the official art—the Reality imposed on the solipsism of the old individualistic regime—is precisely the kind of "self-evident" naturalism, with traces of the older Renaissance tradition—which we find in the early stages of the old primitive

societies of man. This art of "social realism," or "people's art"—"folk art" is what it tends to become—is the art of the future, if a-humanism triumphs in the world.³² In time, this folk art may become stereotyped, and develop into abstract patterns and the other features we see in advanced primitive societies. But this would be something vastly different to modern art.

Either folk art, or no art at all—these are the alternatives which a-humanism presents to the modern artist. It is well to understand this. It is well to recognize the a-humanistic element in modern art, to recognize its origins and its outcome. For the convinced a-humanist, this outcome, and neo-primitivism, is to be welcomed. For those who are not convinced—and these are still, I think, a majority both among modern artists and laymen—the new art, and the new society, are not worth the price.

³² The connection between modern art proper and present-day primitives has never, it seems to me, been adequately analyzed. It is entirely to be expected that there should be a close connection: "The Cubists and their friends . . . were the first to be taken with the *Maîtres Populaires de la Réalité*, especially with Henri Rousseau . . ." (Maximilien Gauthier, *Maîtres Populaires de la Réalité*, "Masters of Popular Painting, Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1938, p. 21.) But the explanation of the connection given here and elsewhere seems to me inadequate, failing to touch fundamentals.

ARCHITECTURE AND MODERN ART

Winston Weisman and Seymour Fogel

ONE ASPECT of contemporary art which has not received the amount of attention it deserves from artists, historians and critics alike is the problem of integrating painting, sculpture and architecture into a modern symphony of creative form. It seems odd that we who pride ourselves on our cultural accomplishments not only have failed, thus far, to produce a true amalgam; but what is more serious, have failed, seemingly, to recognize the need and desirability of such a program. Certainly, there has been no widespread and concerted effort in America to bring the arts together since WPA days. Nor are there strong and positive indications that the situation will change for some time to come.

And yet, dark as the future of integration appears, the horizon is not without a few bright spots. In surveying the field, one notes a few, scattered attempts to bring the arts into close relationship. At Assy, Audincourt and Vence, France, the Catholic Church, in recognition of the spiritual values of contemporary art, has sponsored the building and decoration of churches in which architects, painters and sculptors have contributed. In the civic and commercial areas, the State Capitol at Lincoln, Nebraska and Rockefeller Center, are two other examples of collaboration. Whether any of these monuments are truly integrated on a high level of achievement is debatable and beside the point at this moment. The fact is they indicate an awareness on the part of those responsible for the projects that art and architecture should be joined for spiritual, social, economic and esthetic purposes.

Another encouraging sign is the amount of literature that has been appearing lately in our art publications on aspects of our subject. Last June, *The Magazine of Building* reported on a "debate" in which the topic of integration was discussed. More recently, *The Magazine of Art*, *The Journal of the American Institute of Architects*, *Art and Architecture* and others, have published articles on mural painting and architectural sculpture which suggests there is some interest in those problems. Of course, all of these things leave little or no reason for rejoicing on the part of those of us who would like to see an integration of the arts on a high plane become a reality. However, it does suggest that with proper nourishing this tiny and tender seed we see today might one day grow into a great and beautiful thing. What seems important at this time to do what we can to keep it alive by formulat-

ing a constructive approach to the obstacles which presently stand in the way of its development.

If we are to do this, we must first try to find out what the obstacles are. In this respect, *Building's* forum (June, 1951) is very helpful. In it twelve architects commented on the question: "Are there new opportunities for integrating sculpture and painting with architecture?" The answers are so revealing and provocative and have such a direct bearing on this matter they are worth quoting in brief:

Jack Hillmer: "Neither painting nor sculpture have a very important place in our life today . . . the best way of 'integrating' sculpture with contemporary architecture is to melt them down and make bronze hardware of them."

A. Q. Jones: "The question probably should have been . . . 'Do you believe that sculpture and painting will cease to exist?' . . . Seriously, I believe they will."

William McMaster: "Architecture, sculpture and painting are entities within themselves and therefore cannot be integrated."

Breger and Salzman: "Integrate painters with painting, sculptors with sculpture . . . and architects can go on from there."

Hugh Stubbins: "I don't believe there will be any opportunities . . . until the architect, the painter and sculptor are on speaking terms with each other's work."

Carl Kock: "The sculptor and the painter are, perhaps, more to blame than the architect for failing to get their way of thinking and their way of doing things into buildings."

George Nelson: "The problem is how . . . The traditional notion of nailing naked young men and women onto walls . . . or pasting murals on the insides of buildings seems pretty dead."

Henry Hebbeln: "Yes, yes, yes . . . Le Corbusier's complete integration of architecture with sculpture and painting and the whole with landscape has been an inestimable contribution."

These comments are significant. First, they represent the thinking of the very men who, in many cases, decide whether painting and sculpture shall or shall not be used in the buildings they design. Their attitude towards integration, therefore, is of paramount importance. Moreover these reactions are those of "up and coming" young architects between the ages of 30 and 40 who will play an important part in American architecture for the next 20 to 30 years. What these men think then, will effect the future of integration in a most serious way.

Now what do their comments indicate? Well, it would appear that one of the major obstacles in the path of integration are the architects themselves. To judge from their remarks, most of them are not only convinced that integration is not possible; but they appear aggressively hostile to the idea. In one or two instances, such as in the case of George Nelson, there is an indication that a consummation is desirable; but that the problem is how to accomplish it in an artistic and technical sense. Only one architect, Henry

Hebbeln, is wholeheartedly and enthusiastically in favor of an amalgamation of the arts.

What is so distressing is to find that so many of our younger architects seem to be so shockingly ignorant of our art historical past. It is as though the great alliance of the arts produced by the Egyptians, the Romans, the men of the Renaissance and others, never existed. They seem never to have heard of the glorious cathedrals of the thirteenth century with their sculptured facades and stained-glass windows without which the architecture would have been poorer indeed. It may be true, as McMaster says, that architecture, sculpture and painting are entities within themselves; but that does not necessarily mean they cannot be amalgamated. The past reveals that they have been, and very successfully, too.

Furthermore, these reactions indicate an abysmal lack of knowledge about the development of contemporary architecture which these same architects profess to practice. The contribution of early twentieth century painting and sculpture to the field of present-day architecture is well known. Henry-Russell Hitchcock, the eminent historian and critic, in his book, *Painting Toward Architecture*, has shown how abstract painting, in particular, influenced and helped form the International Style. He goes on at some length to demonstrate how abstractionism after 1911 had an important effect on the revolutionary architectural movement in the 1920s and explains in what ways the early designs of Le Corbusier, Gropius, Oud and Mies van der Rohe were related to the new current in painting and sculpture which grew out of the cubism of Picasso and Braque. It would seem that many of our architects today are unconscious of the debt they owe such men as Mondrian, Theo van Doesburg, Vantongerloo and others who pioneered the modern style. Otherwise, they could not say as Hugh Stubbins does, that there will be no new opportunities for integration until the architect, painter and sculptor are on speaking terms with one another. The fact is that the three were on very intimate terms only a short time ago; and could be again if given the opportunity.

Since some architects apparently are not aware of the part that painting, for instance, can play in conjunction with architecture, it might not be amiss to enumerate just a few ways in which murals could contribute to architectural form. Since color exercises such a direct and powerful influence upon space, murals can enhance the architect's design; or help solve some of his more difficult spatial problems. They can be used as space modulators to subdivide large areas into more pleasing volumes. Static areas can be activated by the use of color tensions. In cases where the opposite effect is wanted, for

example in hospitals, color compositions can produce an atmosphere of serenity and quiet. The schools our children attend could use with profit the gaiety that a design in line and color can achieve. Certainly, architects working on plans for contemporary churches can employ the talents of creative artists to give greater spiritual dimensions to their concepts. And lastly, what of that incalculable quality of inspiration which painting and sculpture can bring to architecture? When Jack Hillmer says that neither painting nor sculpture have a very important place in our life today, he is apparently unaware that the present impasse in which many architects find themselves today of endlessly repeating the International formula can only be avoided by working with artists who are constantly experimenting with free form and color in a way architects cannot because of the economic limitations under which they work.

If Mr. Hillmer is not conscious of this possibility, others in his profession are. The late Matthew Nowicki, writing in *The Magazine of Art* (November 1951) paid tribute to painters like Cézanne who he said "introduced a new taste for purity and simplicity of form" in architecture. He wondered whether the contemporary style would "repeat the sad story of other styles, becoming an addition to the repertory of future eclecticism" and exhorted architects to keep an open mind and to be sensitive to the developments in art and other areas as a source of creative invention. In his own work, especially in his model for additions to the State Fair Grounds at Raleigh, N. C., Nowicki gives evidence of his awareness of other arts. His Livestock Judging Pavilion, for instance, appears to be closely related to the constructions of Gabo and Pevsner. More recently, Dean Hudnut of the Harvard School of Design in a lecture given before the architectural students at the University of Texas pointed up the inspirational and humanizing value of the arts. And as he so well said: "Architecture has to become an art once again."

In view of all this, it is not a little surprising to hear some architects say that painting and sculpture have no relationship to architecture. On the contrary, facts, past and present, indicate not only that collaboration is possible, practical and desirable; but also that they are essential to one another if all three are to go on growing in a healthy and sound way. The problem is not whether integration *can* be realized; but *how* it is to be realized. George Nelson recognizes this when he says "the traditional notion of nailing naked young men and women onto walls or pasting murals to the insides of buildings seems pretty dead." Painters and sculptors must learn to conceive in architectonic terms. They must think in terms of space and materials. Their works must be truly integrated with architecture in the sense that they should be

thought of as a permanent part of the structure. Murals should not be enlarged easel paintings. Nor should they be executed in the artist's studio; but in situ in order to produce the closest possible relationship between wall and mural.

Whether the architects quoted above realize it or not, opportunities for a fully integrated art and architecture are with us as never before. Not only are art and architecture in agreement where form is concerned; but the artist today has at his command a large store of new materials that invalidate the architect's old complaint about the cost and care of mural maintenance. There is available, for example, Ethyl Silicate, a permanent medium for outdoor or indoor use on concrete, hollow tile and cement. This medium combines the beauty of fresco with a greater range of palette. It is impervious to rain, snow, sunlight and other deteriorating elements. Once Ethyl Silicate is applied to the wall it becomes a permanent and indestructible part of the surface. An outdoor mural in Silicate executed for the chapel of the Baptist Youth Center at Austin, Texas, remains in pristine state after three years of continuous exposure to the buffetings of nature. In addition to Ethyl Silicate, the synthetic resins, combinations of color in transparent plastics, baked enamel and mosaic offer fine opportunities for creative expression both for interior and exterior use.

Happily for the cause of integration, there are some architects today who believe art and architecture can become an indivisible entity. These men do not mistake the rich diversity of contemporary art for confusion or indecision on the part of the artist; but realize that this diversity is the result of his inventive powers operating in a varied and complex civilization. What seems to be needed now is, first of all, a respect and knowledge on the part of artist and architect alike of each other's area of creative activity; second, a mutual confidence in each other's ability and the courage to experiment freely; third, a meeting of minds at the very inception of a project to bring about a real unity of creative thinking; and fourth, but certainly not the last in importance, an enlightened patron who would encourage and promote integration by his willingness to carry the costs involved in the interests of a greater result. It would seem at present that we have artists and architects of considerable technical skill, imagination and talent. What is needed now is to get them to work together not only for their mutual good; but for the benefit of all mankind.

PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION, CREATIVE EXPRESSION AND ART APPRECIATION

Fred Logan

ART education in the United States owes much for its development to the Progressive Education movement. During the present period of attack upon nearly every aspect of liberal education, it is a requirement in some circles to give mention of progressive education the oblique stare or to assert bluntly that it was and is compounded of unrestrained child horseplay and unjustified hopes for the millennium.

A careful re-examination of the record of the educational advance guard of the 1920's shows, for the first time in this country, art in the schools that compared favorably in vigor and creative use of the media with the work of the best child art classes of England and Europe. We recognize its genuineness as a true expression of child interest and technical skill. We know too, that skillful teaching was back of it all, that it was not the result of unguided activity.

If there was an area of understanding in the arts for which more was claimed than was accomplished it was that of "art appreciation." The children so wonderfully productive in the art classes of 1925 did not get from that work the kind of appreciation which their teachers expected. But this was true, not because their art lacked quality, but because the common concept of appreciation before the Great Depression was not as clear, was not as well related to child development as were the ideas concerning creative work.

Art appreciation was assumed to be an outcome of art expression. Margaret Mathias in her *Beginnings of Art in the Public Schools*¹ stated "The Problem" in this way, "If we are to hope for a society with art appreciation and some ability to meet art problems, an adequate art course must provide for developing ability for self-expression and for understanding the expression of others."

Simple and straightforward, this dual objective of expression and appreciation appeared in all the aims and purposes proposed in several valuable

¹ Mathias, Margaret, "Beginnings of Art in the Public Schools," 1924, p. 1.

publications of the time. The Francis W. Parker School brought out a study on *Creative Effort* in 1925 as one of its *Studies in Education*.² Teachers contributed from the fields of writing, melody, rhythm, design, drawing and painting, clay work and shop. Characteristic expressions of the new faith were made by the faculty contributors.

"We presuppose that in varying degrees and with wide individual divergencies and tendencies, all normal children possess impulses to create. . . . All normal children have the right to live in a rich environment, to exercise to the full all their powers of expression, and to have every avenue to their souls open and in use. . . . Given freedom, children will create. This we say over and over."³

The Progressive Education Association, in the most ambitious project they had ever attempted for their new magazine, *Progressive Education*,⁴ produced an entire number on *The Creative Experience*. Without doubt its contributors reached the pinnacle of optimistic certitude on the child and the arts. Hughes Mearns set the keynote; what past ages had not achieved might yet be possible—and through the agency of the school helping the child to attain his full stature.

In the lead article, "The Creative Spirit and its Significance for Education," Mearns wrote, ". . . but adults are in the main wingless; convention, tribal taboos, mechanistic living, long years of schooling, something has stilled the spirit within or walled it securely. It is to children we must go to see the creative spirit at its best; and only to those children who are in some measure uncoerced."⁵

Mearns, like Mathias, was aware of limitations, of adaptations and refinements due to come as the years interpreted their work. "Education is at last learning to use the natural creative impulses. At present it is experimenting, and the results are good; it has no assured techniques as yet, but the beginnings are in sight."⁶

Appreciation of art as a primary motif runs through the magazine, but nowhere exceeding the gusto of Frederick G. Bonser in *My Art Creed*:

"I believe . . . that life itself is the finest of all arts and that its richest realization is art's supreme excuse for being. . . .

² Francis W. Parker School, "Creative Effort," volume VIII, *Studies in Education*.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 3, 4.

⁴ Progressive Education Association, "Progressive Education," volume III, no. 2, April, May, June, 1926.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 101.

that the mission of art is to teach a love of beautiful clothes, beautiful households, beautiful utensils, beautiful surroundings and all to the end that life itself may be rich and full of beauty in its harmony, its purposes, its ideals."

These statements were concluded in such a way as to show that the point of view of the rational psychologists, the Hegelian idealists, was still being grafted upon creative expression. (I believe) . . . "that the appreciation of beauty in the thousand common things of daily life will result in the final appreciation of beauty as a dissociated ideal."⁷

In *Art in the School* Belle Boas tried to assure herself and all forward looking art teachers that the coming of good taste and aesthetic judgment into the lives of the young was just as sure as their eagerness to develop creative expression. She wrote, "Probably no one who has been drilled in design will be content with chaos and discord. If he can be made profoundly miserable when in contact with them he will have gone a long way toward eliminating them. . . . All a teacher can do is to produce dissatisfaction with evil; he cannot compel the attainment of good."⁸ So negativistic a note underlines the dubious hopes entertained for any large scale change in public appreciation of the arts.

Art expression on an individualized basis and the analysis of fine art as to its qualities of line, mass, structure, dark and light values, and color; these were to be the keys to art appreciation. While we no longer feel that they will accomplish the job, we are not very positive about either a substitute or a means of amplification. It is time, however that we try to make a distinction between the "Art Appreciation" of 1926 and an alertness to the much greater span of values implied by Dewey in his classic, *Art as Experience*.⁹

A step in the right direction would be that of junking the term "Art Appreciation." It suggests an activity almost impossible to experience for millions of American citizens. A work of art, a masterpiece, is an object of rarity. Most works of art are believed to be in museums, and a few in the shape of buildings are in far-away cities, more often than not, in Europe. Hence, to urge the importance of art appreciation is, in most students' minds, a request to become vicariously excited over a remote object existing for them only in a small engraving. There is a too great limitation in the connotation that has grown up around the word appreciation; we think of a polite tea

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 104.

⁸ Boas, Belle, "Art in the Schools," 1924, p. 3, 4.

⁹ Dewey, John, "Art as Experience," 1934.

table chatter when we really hope for strongly held creative convictions upon which people will take action.

It is in the creative work of the art classroom since the twenties that we have continued to develop. The drive to give an organized expression to experience, and the frustrations which hamper expression, have been made more familiar to us by the psychologists. We are better equipped to encourage individual creation because we know child development in the arts and we know something of the most marked differences in personality types and their influence on art production. Herbert Read¹⁰ and Viktor Lowenfeld¹¹ have supplied us with more material than we have learned to handle.

But in the development of mature aesthetic judgments a comparable progress has not been made. For the majority of the American people art is still held captive to the tradition of the framed painting in oils. Art is a product of dead men, or of other countries than our own, or it is a property to be owned by wealthy people or museums, an object famous enough to be written about in book or magazine. The tendency among artists and teachers to rely upon the relative handful of famous works and famous artists to explain elements of quality in art simply reinforces this attitude.

As an example, any college student taking a survey course in art is much more likely to be informed about the aesthetic quality, the structure, the glass, the sculpture, the sociological and economic background of Chartres cathedral than he is apt to know about any structure in his home town or state. When we come back to this side of the Atlantic in our search for quality we find ourselves still in a rut, with every text that is published wearily peddling the same couple of dozen buildings, and the same old paintings for which photos are easily obtainable, as representing the best in historical or regional development.

It is no wonder that children and adults grow up to feel that art is not in their community, has nothing to do with their lives. The building arts which American school children do grow up with include the mass produced Cape Cod cottages, the new drive-in shopping areas, and the Victorian mansion. These are what the teacher of art needs to deal with. His knowledge, his first hand observations of master works wherever he has traveled, are needed to find and to make known to his students the individual qualities of their immediate environment.

In general, pictorial arts have been approached in the same way as have the design and architectural arts. The teacher's professional background has

¹⁰ Read, Herbert, "Education Through Art," 1945.

¹¹ Lowenfeld, Viktor, "Creative and Mental Growth," 1947.

been such that he emphasized works quite foreign to his students. For them, movies, advertising, magazines, comics, television, are a major part of their experience. And they too often find that what the instructor counts as important art does not help them to form qualitative habits of seeing. Picasso's "Guernica" powerful as it is, may be a poor piece to dwell upon for many students, and the work of Baziotes is beyond the sympathies of most beginners in thinking about pictures. As in the development of their own painting, art understanding can be built only from the basis of the individual's experience.

The teacher cannot afford to be wholly dependent on the latest art magazines nor yet on the content of recent exhibitions. Admittedly, he does not find it possible to select from the popular art of the movies, television, and the magazines except on the most rigorous basis. It resolves itself to this: each teacher must cull from all sources, original and reproductive, close at hand and distant in time or space or both, art works of quality. Every day of his teaching he is solely responsible for the quality, relevance, and interest of the material thus presented. Kouwenhoven, Giedion, Pearson and others are helping us to see what the relationships are between Bill Mauldin and Daumier, Piet Mondrian and Radio City, The Marx Brothers and Aristophanes.

The problem for the art teacher dealing with children from the sixth grade and upwards is that of finding and making opportunities paralleling class activities, for calling attention to the aesthetic content of the world the children know. The great contribution that Giedion et al., have made is that of helping us to see how the excellent, the really bad and the over-supply of the mediocre, taken altogether, make up any period of society constituting the soil from which the finest art forms spring. The child who lives engrossed in the comics is satisfying his aesthetic hunger with cheap and vulgar fare, to use Dewey's terminology. But the tragi-comic masterpiece of burlesque that is Charlie Chaplin's "Gold Rush" will be found to appeal to the same hunger. And as the child approaches and enters high school he is capable of making some of the analyses necessary to understand the contrast between ephemeral and lasting works.

It will always remain the teacher's task to grow in his own vision and judgment and to guide his students' growth in aesthetic insight with all the materials that can be found. When the teacher begins this job of awakening or of making conscious, aesthetic interests and evaluations in young peoples' experience he must demonstrate the personal courage and ability to apply his broader background to a stimulating use of the resources of the child's environment. He must get together, in the form of clippings, slides, motion

pictures, all that can be used in the class room of recent art works from which he uses that which he thinks can be assimilated by the individuals and the classes as he knows them. He is not freed from the responsibility of finding qualitative distinctions for the child to grasp among the buildings in his home town, the automobiles on the street, the movies shown in the local pop-corn palace, as well as among the pieces that may be shown in the local museum exhibit.

An appreciation of the arts which was to have grown casually as a by-product of individual art expression has to give way to deliberate education in aesthetic awareness.

Because a boy paints with an intense emotional projection, particularly strong in color relationships, we no longer count on an automatic emergence of his aesthetic judgment. But when the intellect is ready, (that may be any age from eight to twelve) his interest in everything, paintings and automobiles, technicolor and public park gardens, can be enlarged by becoming conscious of comparative aesthetic values. For such a child his dominant expressive use of color might well determine and be the chief enrichment of his individual vision.

As Mearns put it, . . . "we have no assured techniques in sight," but we realize that "appreciation" should be improved upon by an aesthetic awareness as fixed a part of the personality as the sense of balance.

REMARKS ON THE PROBLEM OF FORM*

Adolf Hildebrand (1847-1921)

EVERY ordinary person is capable of visual perception and imagination. What must the painter or sculptor possess in addition, if he is to be distinguished? He must be able materially to represent the visible part of Nature, and that not in a merely mechanical manner but through a foregoing subjective preparation of the substance to be represented.

Few will contradict me when I say that not everything offered to us as painting or sculpture deserves such a name as a title of distinction. The subjective preparation of the substance has its qualifications which we may inquire after.

An analogy will aid us. We recognize the difference between the use of conversational language or what we call "prose" and the language ability of a poet. Prose, no matter how well it may serve its purpose, is not regarded as an artistic, or aesthetic, creation. The poet must possess something additional, a specific capacity for a configuration of words beyond that needed for prose writing.

In an analogous way we have to differentiate between that visual representation which serves an artistic purpose and that which serves the needs of ordinary life or even the severe needs of the man of science.

Visual perception and imagination in all their relations to human life are to be regarded as the raw material out of which the artist, in accordance with his preconceived plans, develops the presentable object of art. For this development he needs a special gift for applying the well-known scientific understanding of the functioning of the organ of sight to the requirements of an aesthetic end sought. What are these requirements of an aesthetic end? That is the question discussed in this article.

In the first chapter of my booklet "The Problem of Form" I made a sharp distinction between viewing things from a distance and viewing things from near-by. The object may be the same in name, but the physiological adjustments and reactions of the seer are vastly different. Writers on aesthetics

* Translated and condensed from *Sddeutsche Monatshefte*, III, pp. 238-245, 1896 by Max F. Meyer, translator of Adolf Hildebrand's famous *The Problem of Form*, New York.

have sometimes restricted themselves to comparing a variety of represented objects named, have tried to find in each of these named objects the true cause of the aesthetic effect; such aestheticians thought that the process of seeing the object was a so-called "constant quantity" as the physicists say, and therefore a negligible quantity in the comparison. This will decidedly not be the essential feature, the end, of our inquiry.

Quite the contrary, I regard the process of seeing as the variable the significance of which we must investigate. The named object seen, in itself, I regard as definitely of minor aesthetic importance. Nature seen from near-by may fill some spectators with a veritable sensual pleasure; they insist on getting theatre tickets for the front row, and the same object seen from a distance is called by them "unclear" or "meritless." Occasionally the reverse may also happen, and the near view may be "meritless," the distant view the tolerable, the preferred one. In order to become a source of artistic representation, differences of that kind must first be eliminated. The raw material must become the "constant quantity" negligible in the sense of the physicist.

The concept of "unity" has always played its traditional role as standing in the center of aesthetic evaluation. I am far from rejecting it. But I do not here include such a unity as that of a living being, plant, animal, human, composed of so many organs incapable of being separated without death. Aesthetic unity is to me, in vision, the unity of the subjective act of perception. It consists in the orderliness of the details which constitute the totality of the visual percept.

In my booklet I argued that only in the distant view is aesthetic unity possible. Such a unity presupposes temporal unity, that is, the absence of any need for composing our perception out of details perceived at different moments of time. It presupposes a perception possible for the absolutely motionless, the resting eye.

The question then is: how does the resting eye function? What does it *not* do? We know that the greatest distinctness of our field of vision lies in the fovea. Peripherally from that, the retina gives us impressions of less and less distinctness. Any object of interest, say, a candle which stimulates a peripheral point of the retina, is at once reflexly reacted to by the external eye muscles turning the eyeball so that the flame now stimulates the retina in the fovea and thus obtains greater distinctness. That takes time, although not a great deal of time. If we do not take the words too literally, we may say that the eye is "attracted" by an interesting object as a moth is attracted by a light.

When one side of an object is illuminated and the other shaded, the

brighter side "attracts" the eye. Various objects which are all illuminated are tied together by this community of illumination into a unit for a visual perception.

Let us place two burning candles right and left and not so close together that both can fall upon the fovea of the retina. If our eye accidentally is attracted first by the right flame, the left one "tempts" the eye to leave the right one and to "examine" the left one now. The aesthetic unity is thus abated because it depends on a timeless perception. In a piece of art such a condition is an unsatisfactory one. Even the reduction of distinctness of the flame on a peripheral part of the retina is not always effective to prevent such a break of the aesthetic unity.

When two such lights compete with each other, we must weaken one of them sufficiently to abolish any reflex tendency to turn the eyeball in its direction.

Generalizing we can say that all the details impressing the retina must form such a gradient from the center toward the periphery that they all "point" toward a single center of fixation. In that way the total perception is aesthetically unified.

A further factor for the aesthetic unification of the perception is the clear indication of the vertical and the horizontal. Brightness, darkness and color effects are often a great help in determining the location of the vertical.

These are some very commonplace remarks concerning the conditions which a resting spectator puts under all circumstances on the artist. He desires to be left alone, undisturbed. The artist must be sensitive to this desire of the spectator. In properly reacting to this desire of the spectator consists the elaboration of his raw material by the artist. Here we discover the distinction between him who has the gift of an artist and him who does not have it. The sensual irritation of the spectator is not the factor which creates the aesthetic value of a presentable object of art. Its value results from the success of the subjective elaboration of the named object by the artist who builds the work of art.

Now the third dimension: In the foregoing we have thought of the spectator as if he were a relatively passive mechanism, a kind of camera obscura which receives the picture on a chemically receptive film or a kind of camera lucida where a draftsman can catch with his drawing pen the picture thrown on the screen. But the spectator is more than such a passively, reflexly, functioning animal organism. The spectator is also an actively functioning mental organism. The process of seeing, when it is more distinctly a mental

process, consists in the interpretation of the view with respect to its composition in the third dimension ("in successive planes" as I said in my booklet), in relative depth. This interpretation is an imaginary adjustment of the eye for more and less distant points of sight. That this vision of distance is no sensory but only an imaginary adjustment of the eye in our case, goes almost without saying, for the real adjustment of the eye through the varying accommodation of the lens within the eyeball is out of the question when a mere painting is presented to the eye, not a real piece of Nature.

During the passivity of the spectator as we spoke of it in the earlier paragraphs, the spatial, that is, three-dimensional form of the distant view plays a minor role. During this activity, the active, though imaginary, movement of the spectator's eye back and forth through the depth is an essential determiner of the aesthetic unity. For the artist, therefore, his problem is a double one, to suit the spectator's mental passivity and also his mental activity.

A certain modernistic impressionism¹ believes that the artist's problem of form can be solved by meeting only the requirements made by the "passive" (as I called him) spectator. Nature then is taken only as a kind of colored rug, textile woven, mosaic; and the mental productivity of the spectator is disclaimed. I might call this conception of the aesthetic unity the receptive conception; one might even say the optical or physiological conception of aesthetic unity.

From the broader standpoint of defining the aesthetic unity, the question cannot be omitted, "To what extent is there unity, harmony, in the perception of the depth represented by the picture?" A new task of elaborating the raw material of nature is placed before the artist. Contrasting this conception of unity with the above receptive or optical conception of unity, I might call it the artistically productive conception of unity. The aesthetic pleasure of the first and the aesthetic pleasure of the second must be distinguished in order to give to each its proper significance.

He who discusses the passivity of the spectator might submit the following argumentation, "Nature gives to our eye only a two-dimensional picture. When we see it, the perceiving happens in us and is not a part of nature. If we paint a true picture of what is impressed on us, we shall see it in exactly as many dimensions as we see nature itself. Therefore we are not concerned with any problem beyond what is inherent in two dimensions and the color display in them." That has the appearance of true logic. But the argumenta-

¹ Footnote of the translator: I do not know which particular "impressionists" Hildebrand had here in mind. M. F. M.

tion is deficient in its overlooking of the fact that the third dimension is perceived by us by the help of very definite features of the two-dimensional picture; transpositions for example. Thus the forcefulness of our three-dimensional perception depends on if, and with what effectiveness, these features are included in the picture. It is undeniable that in nature as it happens to be there these two-dimensional features pointing out the depth are often very diminutive; and that nevertheless the fortuitous spectator may not complain. We use stereoscopic vision, based on the report coming differently from the two eyes, so unconcernedly when confronted with nature that often we do not miss its absence in the greater distances and do not even put before ourselves the question whether what lies at a distance, if impressing us in isolation from what is near, would be capable of giving us the consciousness of roominess.

However, for the painter this diversion of attention is no excuse. He must give us the consciousness of roominess with only the two-dimensional features of the distant picture. For him there is not even imagined stereoscopy. Thus the painter is handicapped when competing with natural objects and scenery in giving us the consciousness of reality. This competition forces the painter to concentrate his efforts upon making a maximum use of all possible indications of depth. He is aware of the fact that he cannot compete if he merely takes an aspect of nature as it happens to present itself. He must intentionally, with foresight, avoid a merely accidental presentation of nature. Or if he does not altogether avoid it, he must change it, make it expressive of roominess, before he even considers its elaboration for the mere passive perception of the spectator as we discussed it first. If he does not succeed in this changing, adapting nature for his purpose, the deficiencies which might, are likely to, lie in the picture as given by the camera, will not only persist but will even become disagreeably prominent to the aesthetically trained spectator.

It is not enough to see something in a frame that looks as something seen from a window. What we see within the frame must also have a maximum of impressiveness with respect to roominess. Only then does the object of art which we see deserve the name of a true object of art.

The true object of art is a unity complete in itself. It is an object independent of the remaining world. The spectator must have the experience of pure perception devoid of all consciousness of end served and practical usefulness. Aesthetic perception thus becomes a kind of dematerialization of the spectator. In order to bring that about, the artist must not regard anything as negligible: How the elements group themselves, how they cut one another

in transposition, everything that makes the slightest contribution to the comprehensibility of the spatial arrangement.

This artistic reproduction, adaptation of a bit of nature to the aesthetic demands of the spectator, is thus a kind of marriage of two living partners, the mental desire for perceiving depth with the physiological reflex functioning of the eyeball. In executing this combination the artist reveals his specific gift, his genius.

Both partners of this marriage have in common that the unity has its foundation in the restfulness, the timelessness of the eyeball. I do not deny to the modern impressionism the virtue of also emphasizing the restfulness of the eyeball.

In the ordinary inartistic person his interest in the named object of the picture is so strong that it determines the movements of the eyeball, and the artistic unity is crossed out. The result then is a kind of story told, by Nature or by the picture indiscriminately.

One cannot deny, of course, that nature directly on occasion offers a kind of artistic revelation. But such occasions are rare. When they occur, the "What" we see and the "How" we see become indetical. We can find examples in the work of Masaccio (1401-1428), Velasquez (1599-1660) and Marées (1837-1887), to mention representatives centuries apart and of different epochs in the art of painting. Masaccio in his frescoes in the cloister of the Carmine in Florence thus gives the most mature picturesque impression with the most simple means. Velasquez at the height of his artistic accomplishment gives us examples of the same value. Marées in spite of many imperfections demonstrates artistic ability of showing spaciousness with aesthetic unity.

While the painter can paint only on a flat surface, and the sculptor of low relief is equally limited, just substituting shades of light for the colors of the painter, the sculptor who works "in the round" presents an object of art which the spectator can treat *ad libitum* like anything in nature. The perceptive function then depends on the point of view, is variable with the angle of sight which the spectator selects.

Many a modern would-be sculptor regards as possible the direct translation of the method of modern impressionist painters. For example, he chooses as point of fixation the nose of a man's head, cuts it out sharply and by degrees models everything else less and less clearly. I should call this nonsensical. He cannot prevent the spectator from changing to another position

from which to see. This must more or less but inevitably change the point of fixation; and what is clear and what is unclear no longer is in the right place. Clarity of vision is a part of the manner of seeing; it is not a quality of the object shown.

Nevertheless this fact does not dispense the artist from arranging the parts of the three-dimensional figure and to form them so that the distant view of the spectator is the proper one. Herein lies the particular skill of the sculptor. The figure has a double existence: a real existence and an existence as a source of optical effects. Both concern the sculptor. Here, as in painting, the difference between the naive conception of seeing and the artistic conception of seeing becomes apparent.

The naive sculptor does not make himself conscious of that difference. He thinks only of that real object. He fails to appreciate the necessity of arranging the parts of the figure so that they make a visual impression strong for the active, depth perceiving spectator in spite of the limitation to being a distant view. He thinks only of stereometric reality; and the mere consideration of such cubic measurements grows like a weed in the garden. The actual purpose of the garden is forgotten. Some time later he remembers that his work is something to be seen by the aesthetically trained spectator, but it is then too late, and the sculpture remains dull and unclear to the spectator.

In contrast, quite primitive sculpture, although defective as a study of Nature and revealing a good deal of ignorance, often impresses the spectator as a piece of high aesthetic value. Many a primitive artist reveals himself as a genius in spite of those personal faults. Many a modern sculptor shows that he has thought of his work only as seen from near-by and stereoscopically. Unfortunately the public has become somewhat accustomed to thinking of sculpture in the latter sense. From near-by an arm of a figure may be quite realistic and yet from a distance it may be an incomprehensible spot. Lots of people never think of looking at a sculptured figure from a distance. Naturally, it is even more difficult than in painting to persuade them that that is the wrong idea of appreciating it. Even to art students this remains often a *terra incognita*.

However, although only sketchily, the problem of the sculptor has been above outlined. Three questions are always to be raised. (a) Is the eye involuntarily attracted to the principal point and tempted to rest there? (b) Does the totality then offer itself as a perception comprehensible and clear without any eye movements? (c) Does it tempt the spectator to prolong this unity of perception because of the aesthetic pleasure derived from it?

When these questions are answered in the affirmative, when the infinitely

complicated mixture of mental and sensual receptivity is kept in balance like a sensitive seismograph, then we stand before the object of art as if breathless. That is the true aesthetic experience.

THE COLLEGE AND ADULT EDUCATION¹

Peter Fingesten

THROUGHOUT its long development concordant with the growth of Western Civilization, the college has continually broadened its place in the community. What was once simply a meeting place for the exchange of philosophical ideas, or an institution limited to sacred and classical studies has become vastly more democratic in scope before our very eyes. As our individual interests have become wider, and as the fruits of intellectual expression have become available to greater proportions of our population, the college has been enlarged to encompass all the vital problems of our society—scientific, political, artistic and philosophical. Today we expect that our leaders in nearly every field will have received a college education. This is no longer a label of educational exclusiveness, but a badge of good citizenship earned from the democratic experience of group learning.

More recently, the scope of the college or university has been even further widened by the inclusion of a new group—the adults. With the addition of adult education to the curriculum, the college can now reach into all levels of the community. Some of our schools of higher learning have made auspicious beginnings in all phases of adult educational needs and interests. The college promises to vault once more over its ivy-covered walls into the market place, from whence it began two thousand and five hundred years ago.

In any case, education is a continuous process throughout one's entire life. It does not always need to be channeled to be effective, (as self-made men have amply proven) but enormous advantage is to be gained from guided adult education along well thought-out lines under the tutelage of professional educators.

The learning capacity of an adult is greatest when he feels the need

¹ Abstract of an address given at Pace College, November 11, 1951.

for self-improvement and thereupon enrolls in a class of his own choosing. The need for specialized education usually increases in an adult some years after the completion of his formal schooling. The recognition of a need for more education, and the maturity of mind based upon personal experience and observation make the adult an ideal student. The extraordinary scholastic record of the veterans in the colleges after World War II is well known to all of us.

Self-improvement is not the only need which adult education can fulfill. There has rarely been a period such as the present when man was more divorced from his creative impulses. The frantic tempo of our mechanized civilization does not permit the average citizen to pause and enjoy the talents with which every man has been endowed. Unfortunately the greatest emphasis is being placed upon speed and the degree of commercial success at the expense of the profound satisfactions which are to be derived from working with one's hands. The great concentration of effort required by our competitive world at urbane tasks has resulted in a mental stagnation which in a large measure has prevented the adult from expressing himself creatively in his leisure time.

This great problem of the average citizen can be solved by adult education. Very often we run across the case of a successful business or professional man who has worked the major part of his life-time in providing for his family, but, upon retirement, lacks any hobby or outside interest. Frustration and conflict are inevitably the result, for the modern man has forgotten how to play. His hands lie idle, for they have never been trained.

Man has been more active in the creative endeavors of his community in other periods in history. In many cases he had a greater personal sense of participation which enabled him to share in the creative experiences of other men. He was able to partake of others' enthusiasm for the same work and ideals. He was more integrated in his group, and shared in a sense of community achievement. The strain and stress of modern society demands outlets through educational adventures and employment of the hands in creative endeavors. Those activities which respond to the deepest needs of modern man will save many individuals from the psychoanalysts' couch, and at the same time, be of great value not only to the individual himself but to society as a whole.

In creative work of any kind, man finds inner peace. Through the work of the hands we come to grips with reality—and with ourselves. The happy integration and synthesis the adult student finds in expressing himself creatively has not only been stressed by the educators but by the psychologists

as well. It can hardly be doubted that the most meaningful and permanent gratifications are to be derived from the contagious interest in literature, philosophy, and the figurative arts.

The educational needs of the adult are more individualized than those of the regular college student. The teacher must therefore be more flexible in his approach, and more attentive to the personalities of his adult students. Adult education should therefore be less formal than the usual classroom routine. Informality, discussion, friendliness and genuine interest must lead to a rapport between student and professor. To accomplish this, adult classes should always be small. A lecturer should try to follow the inclinations and interest of the students in planning his work rather than to rely too much on his students to follow him at every turn. Discussion, for example, may be initiated by the lecturer in the form of a suggested topic, but the discussion must be held on the floor. The student must be drawn into the classroom procedure rather than be only a spectator.

We have heard too often this statement from prospective adult students: "I can't draw a straight line". As a matter of fact nobody can—not even a Dürer or Leonardo. We hate straight lines, unless they are of the order of Piet Mondrian. We stress individual expression without any of the popular or academic prejudices. Our teaching method of repeating a given motif several times and thereby perfecting technique and conception enables the student to watch his progress from sketch to sketch. Actually the student teaches himself and in a relatively short time the great creative potentials of his personality are revealed, far beyond the initial expectations of the student.

Since adult education on a large scale is a comparatively new field, it is fortunately not encumbered by traditions. In fact, in order to be most beneficial, adult education should depart from the conventional academic procedure as far as possible. The lecturer must be aware that most of his adult students attend classes voluntarily. They are usually not interested in degrees or grades, but in self-improvement, self-expression, or occupying leisure time to good purposes in a constructive or creative manner. Most adult students seek the personal satisfaction of studying a subject of their own choice, or of creating with their own hands. They are cooperative and attentive as long as they feel something worth-while is being accomplished. Adult education should therefore attempt to meet the needs of the community throughout the wide range of subjects from general education to the arts, crafts, music and the dance.

From a large part of the citizenry (and from certain circles in the educational world as well) adult education still meets with resistance. Much of

this is due to conventional prejudices against "going back to school", psychological inhibitions, etc. Some colleges and universities have felt that their academic standards would be lowered with ensuing loss of prestige. On the contrary, the stake of the educational institution in the community will be immeasurably widened by including the adults in its aura of inquisitiveness and learning. Adult education, while taking place within the school, is nevertheless extracurricular and is the ideal medium to draw the individual citizen closer to the educational leaders of his community. The few remaining prejudices and inhibitions of the public must be overcome as well as the opposition of those educators and administrators who wish to remain aloof from this significant development in democratic education. Both will benefit from the increased mutual interest and support, but also in the immediate and future return of good will.

THE UTILITARIAN FALLACY IN ART TRAINING

Peter Kahn

THE University Art Department is facing continuous pressure from certain groups who advocate a more utilitarian approach to the training of our students. It is well, therefore, to reexamine the primary function of art training on the college level.

We either assume that the art experience fulfills a basic need of man in his search for self-realization, or else we must hold that art functions as a mere instrument: ornamentation, a luxury item that decorates the basic activities of man, or a means to make instruction more palatable; at best a means of satisfying sublimated wishes. More popularly yet, art is considered to be a special knack, a skill in the use of materials, which should be exploited on the market place.

The question of what art students (and for that matter all students taking art courses in a university), should be taught is dependent on which-ever assumption is held to be valid. If, in short, we assume that art values are terminal values, themselves the realization of the individual's potential creative powers, and not the means *only* to fulfill whatever other desires a man may have, comfort, happiness, wealth, etc., then we are forced to conclude that

the teaching of certain techniques dealing with the market application of art, while useful, is not an essential part of art training on the college level.

A further consideration here is our attitude toward the function of universities. There again we might conceive of them as trade schools on a somewhat glorified level—or as institutions that teach us the knowledge and values that make a life worth living by giving it content and meaning. That the university teaches the complex techniques and knowledge of special fields as well is not only necessary but all to the good. A university that cannot provide the student with both the broad understanding of his society's traditions and values as well as with the knowledge in his chosen field of interest does not fulfill its function to student or society.

Our universities have changed curricula in recent years in order to fulfill the more immediately practical needs of the community (thereby revealing a general cultural trend which is not confined only to the campus). More and more "educators" and "leading citizens" are demanding that the course offerings be more "practical", meaning thereby that the college graduate be more prepared to face the immediate needs of industry and commerce (whether they coincide with his own needs is a question that cannot be answered here). The proponents of utilitarianism are as vocal (and probably as powerful) in the art departments as elsewhere on the campus.

An article published in a recent issue of this journal¹ is about as typical of this attitude as any. The writer of the article complains that "in university and college art programs . . . art students are not being trained to take a place in business or industrial life of today. Mainly, students are given a little training in drawing, painting and art history with the assumption that they will somehow become adjusted to business or industrial life later. It is obvious to everyone except the art teachers that an art program of this kind is entirely inadequate." We are not concerned here with the way the writer is stacking his cards by the use of the term "a little training" (after all, he won't deny—and he does not—that drawing, painting and art history hold an "important place").

Here is the central question: Shall University Art Departments teach art as a means only to produce industrial designers, advertising men, etc., etc.,—or is the main function of the college art department to make the students aware of the possibilities of quality in their life, both through the understanding of formal principles *and* the unfolding of free creative activity.

¹ Worth D. Griffin, "University Art Training for What?", *College Art Journal*, Winter 51-52, pp. 87-92.

Where else but in the university can this task be fulfilled more effectively, within the framework of a general education. If, of course, we consider the college a means only to make a *better living* (this must not be confused with the concept of a *better life*, as it often is) then the university has no right to allow its students to waste their time studying literature, archaeology, the history of Rome, or Ethics. Mr. Griffin says: "At present there are too many art graduates pumping gas, or sorting vegetables in grocery stores." (p. 88)

Let me assure you here that I have not the slightest intention of denying the possibility or need for applied art training in the college. But let us place the emphasis where it belongs. The designer who has no awareness of the quality of the free creative activity and the concomitant perception of visual organization may be able to learn all the hackneyed tricks of the trade; he will never be a designer.

The above quoted article goes on to describe "the college professor of art (who is richly [sic] rewarded for a few days work per week and protected from want in his old age) who sits in his attic and expresses his emotions in paint. But it is wrong for him to assume that attic emoting is a desirable objective for all young artists studying art today, or that it is a suitable life's work for a student who wishes to live a happy, wholesome existence." Aside from the language used, there seem to me certain basic defects in this last proposition. First of all, does "the professor of art" really assume that all his students will or should become painters. I doubt it. If he really teaches art (and not only techniques or explosions on the canvas) he teaches awareness of our qualitative seeing, an awareness that is important for the artist, the designer (I distinguish here advisedly) and the so-called layman-consumer. And what does the writer mean by "a happy, wholesome existence?" He is obviously implying, no—saying outright, that emotion in the attic is not a suitable life's work for a wholesome, happy person—exactly that which he says "the professor of art" is doing. And these professors are the people, we hear later on, whom the taxpayer is supporting.

We never find out in the article what it is that a good art education can give us except skills, techniques, a place in industry. Nothing is said about what the teacher can do to raise the student's level of understanding and sensibility. Is this basic understanding of all the art forms merely a burden that could never help the individual as he interacts with his society? Here, I believe, is where the narrowness of utilitarian principles may show disastrous results. It empties life of meaning.

The entire notion of "good design", "first-rate creative work" (which the author of the article uses profusely) rests on the concept of qualitative

differences. Surely these differences exactly are made apparent in their pure form by the creative artist. Our awareness of these differences results from our experience with the works of great artists, with the free expressive use of materials, and with the acquisition of formal disciplines existing over and above particular functional objects. The learning of special techniques in art is incidental—the advertising apprentice learns them as well, or better, than the student in the “art-room”. What the apprentice doesn’t get is the basic knowledge of art forms as social and individual values, the lessons of art history and of free and creative experiences. If the industrial employer prefers to hire a man who only knows specific skills without an understanding of their relation to our culture and our values, there is little to do but to educate him or feel sorry for the society in which the employer plays a powerful part. It seems a more fruitful enterprise to educate *him* as well as his staff, an enterprise to which the American university is certainly dedicated.

Mr. Griffin is concerned about the “fact” that “creative expression as we understand it, which is only one facet of art, is of course divorced from the practical aspect of life.” By his very divorce of creative expression from the practical life he introduces semantic distinctions that are not possible to separate in “actual life”. He does not concern himself too much with the divorce of art from the “practical life” (according to his implied definition) which is caused by the over-emphasis of the “practical”. If art and its values are obscure today it is because they are unfamiliar, they have no place in this world of material wealth and spiritual poverty.

If spiritual edification and aesthetic meaning are considered by-products, as the author assumes, and not the motivating forces for the creation of the things men make, then it is easily seen why their place in life is only secondary, a means *only*. As a result, art values are confused, relativized, corrupted. The streamlining of an electric iron is considered “art”, distinctions between “fine” and “applied” are used where the term “art” is misapplied in the first place. And art as the expression of man’s relation to his world (what could be more impractical) becomes obscure. What Mr. Griffin seems to overlook here is that he himself helps to widen the gulf of misunderstanding and indifference between artist and public. If the public, or at least that part of our nation that goes through college, is to be taught art principles as “basic training” for a later adaptation in industry and commerce, rather than a basic understanding of these principles as awareness of *visual* qualities, the art forms of today will become more and more esoteric. If we teach in our colleges only those disciplines of which the immediate, practical application is apparent, we may become better machines, but not necessarily better men.

At the same time the knowledge of tradition and values becomes more and more esoteric. It is true that disciplines entirely divorced from life values are meaningless, but the present utilitarian narrowness of vision does not seem to be able to distinguish the concept of "making a living" from truly "being alive!"

CONCERNING YOUNG HOPEFULS WHO WOULD LIKE TO BECOME ARTISTS

C. A. Laely

WE SEE it happen, not once, but hundreds of times. To write about one person will be enough to throw light on a mistake of importance, which has, as far as I know, never been very clearly exposed. The problem is universal. I am writing this from a quiet spot in the heart of France, but I have travelled, have lived in very international places, and have seen it happen to Europeans, Americans, and Chinese. I went to school in Switzerland at one time, and I intend to talk about one typical case which happened there, although, as I said, it might have happened in any country which allows the parents and the offspring to choose a profession for the latter freely. This is the story:

Marcus was the fourth son of a clergyman. The three elder brothers were no problem, they grew up to become ministers. Marcus did not escape the atmosphere of the house, he too had the inclination to become an advocate of the trinity, but I don't know why in heaven's name he did not become a minister, did the father get tired of having the church and nothing but the church in the family? Because the son would have made an earnest minister.

But our Marcus was artistically talented. He played the violin and he painted. Father listened to him, father looked at his paintings and was impressed. Here, one son did something else, something which the father could not do. And father thought, that this was the finger of God, his Marcus was to be a great artist. Being a conscientious Swiss family-father, he did not neglect to ask the right people what to do with his son. Was it to be music or painting?

He got his son to play the violin at church, and he got his friend, a German professor for music, to listen to the concert. Well, it did not come off

too well, the son was nervous, a string broke and so on. So the German professor thought that Marcus should become a creative artist rather than a musician.

The father agreed to show the boy's paintings to a successful *artiste-peintre* to get an opinion. And the successful artist said that there was undoubtedly some talent, that he could of course not say whether the boy was ever to be "great", the boy should try if he cared to. So the boy tried. He went to several art schools in Switzerland and in Paris. In six years he produced one painting which he thought to be worth keeping and a number of drawings.

I have seen that painting. It is a woman's portrait with a freshness about it, which dear Marcus has never again attained. He is quite a bit older than I am, he is nearly fifty by now, but I think that this portrait is still the only fairly original painting he ever did.

But I must not rush my story. Marcus took an atelier-flat in Paris and called himself an artist—that was six years after his first visit to art school. After six years of schooling, he thought, one has learned how to be an artist. He had indeed enjoyed a longer education than most young "artists" who print this title on their cards. Marcus took a flat and engaged models. His father was proud of him, supplied the necessary money and expected his son to paint the Saints. But there you are, the son just never got beyond his first and only girl-portrait; he tried, conscientiously enough, but nothing happened. He turned out five or six large paintings a year, no saints, just Paris-scenes, but dull, so dull. Finally he had been painting for so many years, that there was no getting out of the routine for him, he was and he still is condemned to be an "artist" and to hate it for the rest of his life.

And that is the story. Whose fault—the father's, the son's or the saints who just do not choose to speak through him? Possibly everyone's. But chiefly it is a mistake—that of believing that one can be taught how to be an artist. One either is an artist or one is not, but one can not learn to be one. Talent no doubt is necessary, but talent is not so rare. An "artistic temperament" is necessary, that is rarer. Zeal, pityless self-criticism, and endurance are necessary, and those are rare too. Rarest of all is the combination of these faculties in one person, and this combination is needed to create a valid artistic production.

A man like Marcus, with talent, zeal, self-criticism and endurance is still no *artiste-peintre*, because he lacks imaginative temperament. He might be quite good at teaching children to draw, or at copying old masterworks, or drawing birds and things for an encyclopedia. He would make some money

with that too, would feel independent. It was a mistake to try to make a fine artist of Marcus.

But let us drop Marcus, materially he is well off thanks to a rich father. If ever he should die of boredom it would be just too bad. Many other young men and women are not so fortunate. Somehow they manage to keep alive through the school years and for some years after, until it has become very difficult for them to adapt themselves to another profession or a paying job. Often they have become shy of people, shy of work. Then they "discover crime"; they "go in for politics", especially communism; they aid the proletariat of the intellectuals.

Crime does not pay. I am not the first one to say that, especially when a harmless artist tries to get away with it. Communism—well—I have a friend, a Hungarian. He was a communist until the Russians put him into a concentration camp without trial, where his commanding comrade made him copy a drawing of Stalin's head four thousand five hundred times (fifty drawings a day for three months, that is what he said, he may have overdone it a little, because he was still quite normal).

There is only one way out, and it will have to be propagated by every man or woman who teaches art, if the coming artist is to enjoy a normally secure life. The technical tricks, composition, practise of the hand and the eye, history of art and so on can and must be taught, but let us teach these things in the evenings and on free Saturdays and Sundays. Give the student a lasting chance to find out what he wants. And be sure, that you never accept a pupil who has no solid bread-job during the week days. If he has a little money, all the better for him, but insist that he can not live with a little money and a little art education. Very very few artists can live with the money they earn by selling pictures. Your pupil must first have a job. Do not be afraid to ask an eighteen year old an indiscreet question about his material situation, he or she will thank you for it later on. It is not so difficult to work two things for some time, for the artistic output it is even beneficial, if the person who does it, does something a little different during the better part of the day. It is quite impossible to "create wonderful things" five hundred times. The artists sees something. It may strike him at once that this should absolutely be painted. He goes home and starts work, drawing and painting in or out-of-doors, in front of the object which fascinated him or away from it. It may work, he may "do" it. But more often it will not work, he will carry it in his mind, consciously and unconsciously, he will ponder over the problem, perhaps forget it for days—months—years, and suddenly, when it is ripe, it will come out, it will be born. Then it may be a masterpiece. For

years, yes years he may have to wait for great things to happen. One needs money, to be able to wait for years!

If we look back to the times of the old masters, we read that pictures, sculptures, were demanded in workshops which normally took orders to paint houses, to make chairs; that the novels were written by chroniclers, music composed by organ-builders.

Would it not be a good idea to come back to that practise?

Many professional schools have kept up the tradition, they teach the crafts. Teachers of these schools should be careful not to crush the pupils' enthusiasm. Because one boy out of ten thousand may really become a notable artist some day. Evening classes for fine arts education would be good in these schools. Because even if most pupils will never produce anything worthwhile, these classes could enrich their lives enormously, could save them from turning stale at the age of twenty. For that alone it would be worth trying.

I have tried to take pupils who had done a full day's work before coming to the art class—with varying success of course—for some of them really were too tired and they either gave it up or they came on free days. But a good many came for a long time.

In this short essay I have tried to point out the error of many hopeful young people: that they could go to an art school or university and make their living soon afterward claims too many victims. Try to become a decent free-time artist, and then, if you can sell your work, it will be ever so easy to give up the wage earning job. I do not mean to say that sales prove the work to be good; far from it, but because really good work often does not sell until many years after the artist's death, I think the disciple of the fine arts should have a modest and not too fatiguing bread-earning activity, which would leave him some time to develop himself artistically. I am speaking through the American press, to warn Americans not to copy the mistake which has caused too many unhappy lives over here in Europe. Because the saying that "the artist has to be poor to be able to work" is just as stupid as to say that he can not work if he is not rich. The artistic work of a man who has a fairly normal life is in most cases far superior to the work of a restless-starving, or of a sleepy-overstuffed individual. Exceptions confirm the rules.

THE PROPHET AND THE PLAYBOY "DADA WAS NOT A FARCE"¹

John Alford

SINCE "personalism" is of the essence of Dada it will, I hope, not seem inappropriate that I should begin an account of Robert Motherwell's important book² with an acknowledgement—on Dada principles it should be a proclamation—that my discussion of it is (nothing but) a personal one. Though I have not known any of the people whose activities are recorded—which is perhaps a negative qualification for reviewing this record,—I was there then. And indeed we are all there now. And I don't feel chesty about it.

The standard idea of what Dada was is certainly based on the antics of the Dada Group in Paris between 1920 and 1922, with some recognition that it started in Zurich during the First World War and was the forerunner of Surrealism. The classic source, in English, is Tzara's "Memoirs of Dadaism" published as an Appendix to Edmund Wilson's *Axel's Castle*.³ Tzara was a leading participant and should know. But the fact is that no one participator can write the history of Dada, which was less "a movement" than a drama. Mr. Motherwell likens his compilation to one of "those detective novels in which principal event is described in turn by the various characters in the story." (p. xv). The comparison is apt, except that there is no solution to this "mystery", as there is none to tragedy or tragi-comedy; only a climax, and a hint of a re-beginning in a somewhat altered situation. Some day a poet may use his chronicles as Shakespeare used Hollinshed. He will find a rich *personae* of types and characters to draw on; the play-boy, the pontiff, the picaresque soldier-of-fortune, the clown, the fool, even the saint and the seer (in whom Shakespeare did not traffic). How "Elizabethan"

¹ Jean Arp.

² Robert Motherwell (editor): *The Dada Painters and Poets*. Texts by Arp, H. Ball, A. Breton, G. Buffet-Picabia, A. Cravan, P. Eluard, G. Hugnet, R. Huelsenbeck, G. Ribemont-Dessaignes, H. Richter, K. Schwitters, T. Tzara and others, tr. Ralph Manheim and others. Bibliography by B. Karpel. 388 + xxxii pp, 136 ill. New York: Wittenborn, Schultz; Documents of Modern Art, No. 8. 1951. \$15.00.

³ The catalog of the Museum of Modern Art's Exhibition of "Fantastic Art, Dada, Surrealism," edited by Alfred Barr (1936) consisted almost entirely of illustrations, with a check-list, and covered much more than the Dada movement.

the structure is! Farce, epic, and "mystery", and a great gesture and a final question.

There are also unseen players of the kind symbolized in the allegorical figures of Marlowe's *Faustus*. They are, of course, nowhere clearly identified in these records and different readers will envisage them differently, if at all. I am not tempted to a definitive task but will suggest where they can be found if anyone cares to look for them. First of all, in the "Memories of Pre-dada" of Mme. Buffet-Picabia (pp. 255-267). The stage is set and the prologue is spoken.

"If, since the beginning of the century, there had not been a certain irresistible undercurrent of thought preparing to rise to the surface and seeking formulation, Dada would never have attained the 'historical' importance now given it.

"After the self-satisfied rationalism of the nineteenth century, an ebullience of invention, of exploration beyond the realm of the visible and the rational in every domain of the mind—science, psychology, imagination—was gradually breaking down the human, social and intellectual values which up until then had seemed so solid. All of us, young intellectuals of that period, were filled with a violent disgust at the old, narrow security. . . ."

"It was in 1910, . . . that Picabia's friend Dumont introduced us to Marcel Duchamp. . . . Under an appearance of almost romantic timidity, he possessed an exacting dialectical mind, in love with philosophical speculations and absolute conclusions. . . . In that period Picabia led a rather sumptuous, extravagant life, while Duchamp enclosed himself in the solitude of his studio at Neuilly, keeping in touch with only a few friends, among whom we were numbered. Sometimes he 'took a trip' to his room and vanished for two weeks from the circle of his friends: this was a time of escape into himself, in the course of which the 'sad young man in a train' was transmuted into a captivating, impressive incarnation of Lucifer. The very different temperaments and conceptions of the two men led them to the same extreme point of logical decomposition, to the same immediate, routine logic of the senses. . . . Guillaume Apollinaire often took part in these forays of demoralization, which were also forays of witticism and clownery. . . ."

"Thus they arrived at certain postulates which soon developed into the arcana of the new plasticity and the new poetics: such as the calligrammes and conversation poems of Apollinaire, or the 'ready-mades' of Marcel Duchamp, and above all, the intrusion into the plastic field of the 'machine'. . . ."

"Since the beginning of the century. . . ." Anti-logic, anti-determinism,

anti-morality, are as perennial as conformity and "the quest for certainty." "Humanism" means nothing without that ambivalent perspective. And within that perspective the militant Dadas were the successors of Erasmus and Rabelais, of Bosch and Breughel, of Donne and Cervantes whose names do not occur in the Dada index, as much as of Baudelaire, Rimbaud and Jarry, whose names are frequent in the writings of Dada's commentators. Not by accident, the first meetings of the Dada Group in Zurich were in the Cabaret Voltaire, and Robert Motherwell himself opens his Introduction to this volume with a quotation from Swift; "Once kick the world, and the world and you will live together at a reasonably good understanding." And who was Swift without Juvenal and Apuleius? "Dada is not modern and even less modernistic; Dada is always a thing of the present, hence its posthumous activity" (Hugnet on p. 127).

But there was, of course, a particular temporal significance in Dada. It was indicated in the last sentence in the quotation I have made from the reminiscences of Mme. Picabia: "above all . . . the machine." This, obviously, is not the occasion to attempt to review the impact of the idea and the fact of the machine on our world. One aspect of that complex history was summarized with philosophical genius when Whitehead wrote *Science and the Modern World*. The tortuous and tortured conflict between predictive certainty and freedom, brute power and the finer flowers of what we generalize as "the human spirit", was already evident in the work of the Cubists, and most particularly in that of Duchamp. What Mme. Picabia makes evident is the degree to which it was also manifested in their lives. This,— "Pre-Dada"—is the Prologue to our drama. The declaration of war in 1914 put a brutal end to this period, characterized as much by its rupture with tradition as by fecund realizations whose effects are not yet exhausted.

Act I, New York, 1915-18. *Dramatis Personae*, a group of disaffected intellectual play-boys. Dada is born but not named. From Mme. Picabia's penetrating pages I take a few more descriptive sentences. "The call to arms affected the whole world around us. . . . Our world of abstraction and speculation vanished like a castle in the clouds." By chance rather than choice Duchamp and the Picabias are thrown together again. "No sooner had we arrived than we became part of a motley band which turned night into day, conscientious objectors of all nationalities and walks of life living in an inconceivable orgy of sexuality, jazz and alcohol." There are fantastic reflections of international intrigue and of speculation in arms. "Seen from Broadway, the massacres in France seemed like a colossal advertising stunt for the benefit of some giant corporation". In this setting of degenerate luxury,

treachery and "the world's anguish that everyone consciously or not bore within himself", the incipient nihilism of Duchamp and Picabia developed "almost to its ultimate limits". The story of Rimbaud is repeated on a public scale. Duchamp in particular, "the hero of the artists and intellectuals", embarked on an "experimental study of a personality disengaged from the normal contingencies of human life", "flung himself into orgies of drunkenness and every other excess", "continued to busy himself with his great work in glass, *The Bride Stripped Bare by Her Bachelors, Even*, . . . (only) because it had been purchased prior to completion", and renounced art finally, sending a urinal as his sculptural contribution to a public exhibition.

Act II, Zurich. 1915-1919. Dramatis personae, a yet more motley group of rebellious artists and intellectuals. But the setting is that of an inter-cultural university-city, closer to the European tragedy and less vitiated by the glamour of irresponsible money. The center is not the salons of Park Avenue, but Ball's "Café Voltaire". The major cast: Ball and his wife, incipient Catholic mystics; Arp, an incipient Protestant mystic; Huelsenbeck, an incipient Jungian mystic (if the phrase is permissible); and Sophie Taeuber, the feminine intuitionist, whose emergent image is both witty and tender. If the prospect is no less destructive than that of New York, this group looks to the future with a desperate faith that a future is at least hinted at by Cubism, Constructivism, and Abstract Art. For good or ill, both the strongest public drive and the nihilism are contributed by yet another disaffected intellectual play-boy, the Rumanian, Tzara. Exhibitions and exhibitionism, as in New York, with the same preoccupation with the machine, chance, and personality, and the same spit in the eye for the ethos of accountancy. Debts to Italian Futurism are acknowledged and clear. But there is gaiety as well as desperate determination. And, in distinction from Futurism, there is a detestation of war. And Dada is named.

Act III, Post-war Germany, 1918-22. The Cast: Huelsenbeck, Arp, Ernst, Grosz, Hans Richter, Schwitters, the ubiquitous Tzara, and a host of temporary associates. "The political situation, the revolutionary effervescence and social distress of Berlin amid the decline of a rotting imperialism . . . automatically set spontaneously revolutionary Dada on a positive, realistic plane." (Hugnet, p. 141). To the uneasy cohabitation of nihilism and constructivism, of determined chaos and a "will to formulation", is added an attempt to align Dada with the German communist movement. During those years, "Revolution" was a common banner under which almost anything could march against the old order of imperial-bourgeois plutocracy. In Russia the machine was envisaged by the new "intelligentsia" as a proletarian instru-

ment and a symbol of the "new order". (A very pregnant study might be made of the implications and consequences of its ouster by the traditional craft symbols of the hammer and the sickle.) Huelsenbeck temporarily dedicates himself to this campaign. But the antics of the intransigent personalists, Arp and Ernst, at Cologne in 1920 surpassed even those which later achieved greater notoriety in Paris. There is in this fission a strong forecast of the eventual dismemberment of Dada, and of its Surrealist supersession. For Dada, in its pure personalism, cannot be a "movement" with cultural principles and disciplines. That is at once its essence, its justification, and its limitation.

Schwitters, it may be noted in passing, provides some of the purest comic relief in this Act, both in his incursion into Holland with van Doesburg (p. 275) and in the Nazi postlude an account of which is quoted from Sibyl Moholy-Nagy's book on her husband (pp. xxiii-xxiv).

Act IV, Paris, 1919-24. The Cast: Tzara, Picabia, Breton, Eluard, Aragon, etc., etc. The temporary triumph of the nihilist play-boys. As Europe's traditional breeding ground of intellectual and moral libertinism, Paris, more than any other city, was prepared to pay for being dangerously amused. But shock creates its own immunity. There were increasingly frantic efforts to invent new gags and new forms of subversive exhibitionism. What is surprising in retrospect is that the effort was successful for so long. As Ribemont-Dessaignes remarks in his candid reminiscences, "unexpected considerations of personal vanity made themselves felt." (p. 113) But why unexpected? Tzara sulks and explodes; Breton sulks and explodes; Picabia sulks and explodes. There are squibs and crackers of private insult and recrimination which even helped to keep public interest temporarily alive. When the explosions were concerted, a considerable audience could still be attracted up to the summer of 1922. But, increasingly, after every Dada demonstration, there was "collective nervous depression." Dada by this time was indeed a rather bitter empty farce. "Rigaut, a particularly disorganizing intelligence, proved to be a Dada among the Dadas, that is, he demoralized whatever came into contact with him, and had not a little to do with the ruin of Dada; in short, he did wonders. *And it was he who was right.* He was irreconcilable with any need for doing, producing, thinking. The unity of opposites, which had been so much discussed, and of those two opposites which epitomize everything, life and death, possessed him entirely. He showed how close to death he had been throughout his life . . . by committing suicide in 1929, after having exhausted all the reasons for living a man can offer himself." (p. 111). All, that is to say, except "doing, producing, thinking."

But in the meantime Breton had assumed his Surrealist Dictatorship. And that rings down the curtain on Dada.

There is, however, an indeterminate Epilog, of which Robert Motherwell's editorial activity is clearly a part.

To give the story some additional structural intelligibility (how Aristotelian and un-Dada-ish!), let us go back to the beginning.

From the time of its inception there were in Dada a number of formula-tive elements, over and above the satirical diableries of a protracted adolescence. There was the excitement about the implication of the concept of "the machine", which had acquired an imaginative importance comparable only with its rational importance in Baroque metaphysics. There was its conceptual antithesis, the idea of "chance". And there was yet a third obsession, with "I-ness" or personal autonomy, and with the relation of "I-ness" both to mechanism and to chance. The first two obsessive concerns can be relatively easily formulated and expressed in visual imagery, as can be also their relation to "the person"—with whatever "overtones" (to use a favorite word of Roger Fry) of satire or satisfaction the imagist may feel. But the assertion of "personalism" is both too dynamic and too essentially subjective to be capable of imaginal formulation with both abstraction and clarity. In a culture which calls for its assertion against the conformities both of Statism and of commercial accountancy (the characteristic "bourgeois" discipline) it can only be *acted*, not *painted*, though action may take the symbolic form of a highly personal "art". That need, it seems to me, was the essential link in Dada between those whom, for the sake of a title, I have called "the prophets" and "the playboys." To the playboys, Dada *was* a non-conformist farce, spoiled—betrayed even—by the accretion of any constructive purpose, even that of "art". They have come and gone—to suicide or obscurity, or the rather stale posturing of Surrealism. "Dada lives" only in the personal creative integrity of "the prophets". These were and are something more than intransigently pure "persons" disengaged (as Mme. Picabia says of the erstwhile ambition of Duchamp) "from the normal contingencies of human life." One hates to spoil the fun by adding "as if anyone could be, except by refusing to exist." Nor need one be so pedantic, since the first and the last of the Dada playboys recognized and accepted that limiting condition.

As for "Art", I can think of nothing of any moment in our present day (not even Surrealism) which has not been touched by "prophetic" Dada. (That excludes Matisse and Braque, who, in their last phases appear to me to constitute a strange and beautiful after-glow of "art nouveau" and the symbolic aestheticism of the 1890's). But this continuance clearly provides the

matter for another book. It would have to notice the later developments not only in art (and architecture), but those in the philosophy of Symbolism, best known through Suzanne Langer's *Philosophy in a New Key*, of Chance, as popularized in Bronowski's *Common Sense of Science*, and of Form, natural and artifact, as discussed by a variety of authors in Lancelot Whyte's *Aspects of Form*.

The pseudo-dramatic structure that I have used here roughly follows that of Mr. Motherwell's Introduction; not, I think rather unfortunately, that of his text. I must confess that it taxed my patience to wade through the tropical undergrowth of posturings, bickerings and deliberate obscenities that were an inescapable part of Dada from the start. The play was obscured by a sort of transparent and concurrent view of all that was happening off stage and in the dressing rooms of the cast. And even that analogy doesn't suggest the tedium of seeing and hearing *the same* kind of temporarily amusing shock-triviality so often. That Dada was a farce is all too easily understood. That it was also something more will be more readily grasped, I think, if the reader follows the course I have already indicated in this review: Let him read, therefore, first, Gabrielle Buffet-Picabia: "Some Memories of Pre-Dada", pp. 255-267; second, Richard Huelsenbeck: "En Avant Dada: A History of Dadaism (1920)", pp. 23-40, and Hugo Ball: "Dada Fragments (1916-1917)", pp. 51-54, (these are the prime source for the Zurich manifestations and the first activities in Germany); third, Georges Hugnet: "The Dada Spirit in Painting," especially pp. 141-165, recording the later activities in Germany; fourth, Georges Ribemont-Dessaignes: "History of Dada," pp. 101-120, a first hand account of Dada in Paris by one of the participators, which Hugnet's more judicial history of that period does not greatly amplify. This selection, I notice, is almost identical with the core of material it was originally intended to publish (p. xi). The rest is indeed a valuable addition to the record. But I think that a reader of serious intention but limited opportunity or patience needs just such a framework on which to hang the narrative enrichment, to say nothing of the copious illustration.

By using as a frontispiece to this anthology a photograph of the Dada-Constructivist Congress held in Weimar in 1922, Mr. Motherwell has given prominence to an essential dichotomy which existed among Dada personalities from the start. The dichotomy was already apparent to the members of the Congress, who barely consented to associate. Of the two groups, there can hardly be any question as to which has since contributed most to the formulation of a culture of which the structural elements are given by the scientific enlargement of human circumstances and a corresponding reduction

in the vanity of the "I". However excusable in an adolescent or tragic as an adult attitude, Subjective Nihilism alone is no effective protest, as the later history of "official" Dada bears witness. On the other hand, we cannot deliver ourselves wholly either to the theory or to the practice of The Machine; the constructivist analogy is also insufficient. For that matter, we cannot deliver ourselves wholly to any theory whatever, which is why Huelsenbeck's declaration of 1936 is still true and eternally necessary: Dada Lives! (p. 277). But unfortunately, when one talks of "necessity", one again spoils the Dada fun!¹⁴

* Bernard Karpel's bibliography is stupendous. But he seems to have missed at least one item, of which I happen to possess a copy: F. S. Flint, "The younger French Poets: The Dada Movement," *The Chapbook* No. 17, November 1920, London, The Poetry Bookshop. 32 pp., and 3 illustrations by Picabia and Arp.

CONTRIBUTORS:

John Alford received his B.A. and M.A. from Cambridge University. He was Professor of Fine Arts at the University of Toronto from 1934-45 and at present is Professor of Aesthetics, Rhode Island School of Design.

Peter Fingesten, sculptor, is Associate in Art at Pace College, New York. His last one-man show was held at the John Heller Gallery, New York, October, 1951. He was the recipient of a Tiffany grant, and, in January, 1951, was awarded a prize by the Committee on the Art of Democratic Living.

Seymour Fogel, painter and lithographer, studied at the National Academy of Design in New York. He has won national competitions and has executed murals under Federal programs.

Alan Gowans, formerly graduate student in Art History at the University of Toronto and Princeton, and taught at the Université Laval, Quebec, and the University of Minnesota. He is currently Assistant Professor of Art History at Rutgers.

C. A. Laely is an artist living in Moisson-par-Mantes, France.

Frederick M. Logan received his B.E. at Milwaukee State Teachers College and his M.A. at Columbia University. At present he is Associate Professor, Department of Art Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

May F. Meyer, psychologist and university professor, received his Ph.D. from the University of Berlin, and now lives in Miami, Florida.

Ulrich Middeldorf is Chairman of the Department of Art, University of Chicago.

Winston Weisman, lecturer in art history at the University of Texas, taught formerly at the University of Indiana. He studied at the Institute of Fine Arts of New York University (M.A. 1936) and at Ohio State University (Ph.D. 1942). At present is with the Department of Art, University of Texas.

MONOGRAPHS IN SLIDES

Ulrich Middeldorf

DURING the last fifteen years, Dr. Julius Rosenthal, 5230 Kimbark Avenue, Chicago 15, has issued many valuable slide catalogues. To mention just a few: his *Survey of Western Art* is a most satisfactory collection of material for art survey courses; recently it has been supplemented by a negative file corresponding to the illustrations of the third edition of Gardner's *Art Through the Ages*. His catalogue *Paintings and Sculpture in the NGA, Washington, D.C.* is a comprehensive listing of the important material there. His *Slides for a Course on the History of Chinese Art* is based on Dr. Ludwig Bachhofer's unique material and parallels his *Short History of Chinese Art*. Among his other catalogues *A History of Musical Instruments in Slides* might be mentioned, which was favorably reviewed by outstanding musicologists. Recently Dr. Rosenthal has made a promising start in color photography too.

But probably his most important and original contribution to visual art education are his two catalogues: *Contemporary Artists*. Most teachers of the history of art have been struggling for a long time with the difficulty of procuring material illustrating the art of our own period. The great variety in the work of many contemporary artists precludes its adequate representation by the one or two slides usually available in a slide collection. A more comprehensive survey of modern artists has been needed for a long time. Dr. Rosenthal's two catalogues very successfully fill that need. A list of the artists, included in the two catalogues can tell best the scope of Dr. Rosenthal's undertaking:

Architects: Wright, Perret, Le Corbusier, Mies van der Rohe, Oud, Mendelsohn, Chermayeff, Breuer, Neutra, Lescaze, Eliel Saarinen, Keck, Schweikher and Elting, Belluschi, Harris, Hugh Stubbins, Jr., Twitchell and Rudolph.

Sculptors: Archipenko, Lipchitz, Milles, Moholy-Nagy, Calder, Moore, Marini.

Painters: Leger, Le Corbusier, Chagall, Orozco, Moholy-Nagy.

Photographers: Weston, Moholy-Nagy.

An unique feature of the collection is the fact, that the artists themselves selected the works to appear in it, in many instances from photographs of which only one copy is in existence, that in their personal files. This was

done with the idea, that the artist has the best conception of the range of his oeuvre. He too is subjective, to be sure, but his selection is apt to be the least arbitrary one, at least it shows what he considers his most representative works. The selections of Fernand Leger's and Marino Marini's works were made in direct consultation with the artists in Paris and in Milan. Several of the architects—Belluschi, Chermayeff, Harris, Rudolph and Schweikher explain their new endeavors in brief self-introductions printed in the catalogues. F. L. Wright particularly took great pains to give an exhaustive survey of his work. It is fascinating to follow the development of certain of his ideas—for instance the serpentine way in his early drawing and in the model for the Modern Gallery.

Architecture takes precedence in both catalogues. The second series, for the preparation of which Dr. Rosenthal consulted authorities like Walter Gropius, Henry-Russell Hitchcock and members of the staff of the Architectural Forum, affords a survey of some recent trends in American architecture and shows the development of a highly personal style, which may be considered a fusion of the austere International Style of the 1920's and Frank Lloyd Wright's individualism. The selections of the American architects were chosen partly with a view to geographical distribution. The West is represented by Pietro Belluschi and Harwell Hamilton Harris; the East by Marcel Breuer (including his important work as Designer of interiors and furniture) and Hugh Stubbins, Jr.; the Middle West by the prominent architectural firm of Schweikher and Elting; and the South (Florida) by its ablest architect Paul Rudolph (Twitchell & Rudolph). The selections reflect the influence of climate and landscape on architecture. Serge Chermayeff's architecture is shown mostly in examples of the work he did in England. Particularly noteworthy are the pictures of his house in Bentley with Henry Moore's sculpture and landscape architecture.

Highly interesting source material is included in Moholy-Nagy's constructivist stage sets and costume designs, photographed from the original drawings and water colors in Sibyl Moholy-Nagy's collection. Some omissions may be thought striking, but it was considered more important to attain comprehensiveness in each individual monograph, than to extend the number of sets. For that reason artists like Matisse and Picasso, on whom much material is readily available, were not included. Dr. Rosenthal is to be commended for including photography in his selections. A set of Moholy-Nagy's photographic work is found in Catalog I and a survey of Edward Weston's photography covering his work from 1924 to 1946 in Catalog II. Dr. Rosenthal expects to expand this section as his archive is developing.

It is very desirable, that this highly specialized and useful work, on which a great deal of research and care has been spent, may find sufficient encouragement to insure its continuation. The substantial and fast growing negative collection of the University of Chicago Art Department has been at Dr. Rosenthal's disposal for the last fifteen years and will remain so in the future, since we are convinced that we have much material which might be useful for others, and since we believe that a free exchange of such material is beneficial for everyone concerned. We are always glad to welcome visitors to Chicago in our slide collection and to help them in making their choices. We have good faith in Dr. Rosenthal's skill and sense of quality to entrust him with every commission which might be the result of consulting our own holdings of negatives.

CONTEMPORARY DOCUMENTS

AMERICAN SCULPTURE 1951

THE PROTEST:

February 4, 1952

Is this the culmination of American sculpture?

Are you conscious of the fact that the pressure brought by certain aspects of the Modernistic Movement threatens not only art, but the fundamental freedoms of our American way of life?

We believe that the great majority of our serious fellow citizens share our concern over the increasing power exerted by a left-wing art group which has grown from an object of ridicule to a menace in the art world.

The mere fact that there was no member of the Jury of Awards who could be classed as a conservative in the current exhibition of sculptors at the Metropolitan Museum speaks for itself, as do the prizes awarded.

We regard the threatening predominance of a group of an avowed negative ideology as dangerous, not only to art, but to the whole philosophy of national normalcy.

We are sending this to men and women who are leaders in every branch of American life and culture. Please read the enclosed protest which a group of American sculptors plan to send to the Directors and Trustees of the Metropolitan Museum, as well as to the Press. If you are in favor of this protest, please sign a post card and return it with your comments and suggestions to:

Mr. Donald De Lue
Chairman, Special Committee
National Sculpture Society
1083 Fifth Avenue
New York 28, N.Y.

We are convinced this question concerns not only the sculptors, but every individual who believes that inspiration in art is but an empty and bizarre symbol, unless founded on beauty, integrity and craftsmanship.

Jean de Marco
Edmondo Quattrocchi
Katherine Thayer Hobson
Wheeler Williams, Ex-Officio
Donald De Lue, Chairman

To the Directors and Trustees of the Metropolitan Museum of Art:

The undersigned believe that the awards at the current exhibition of sculpture at the Metropolitan Museum epitomize a serious cancer in the culture of our nation.

Democratic tolerance is one of the characteristic qualities of the American people—a spirit frequently construed as weakness by other nations—but, in the face of conditions which endanger the fundamental freedom of our work and national life, our convictions have invariably crystalized into active protest and resistance.

It is in this spirit that the undersigned most solemnly protest to the Directors and Trustees of the Metropolitan Museum in regard to the current exhibition of sculpture being held at the Museum. The art of any nation is the essence of its soul—a sublimated credo—and when the Metropolitan Museum, which has stood for the recognized and constructive forms of art through all the centuries, puts on such an exhibition, and awards thousands of dollars in prizes to work not only of extreme modernistic and negative tendencies, but mediocre left-wing work at that, we may well question what future sculpture has in this country.

The mere fact that there was no member of the Jury of Awards who could be classed as conservative speaks for itself, as do the prizes awarded.

Having complete possession of the Whitney Museum for their experimental work, having taken over the Museum of Modern Art, which was planned for contemporary, not predominantly modernistic art, a very active group of artists is now in the process of establishing its control of the Metropolitan Museum—and, incidentally, the \$100,000 which the Associate Curator of American Art, Mr. Hale, announced the Museum intends to spend in a five-year plan to bring the collection of sculpture into balance with the painting.

It would be very interesting to know from what source or sources the money to stage this exhibition, and make these awards, has been drawn. Apart from the sum brought in by Membership dues, we understand that the Metropolitan's funds are derived in part from generous benefactors—gifts unquestionably made by patrons who had been inspired by the great works of the past, and hoped that American Art would also contribute to the ennoblement of our culture and civilization—and, in part, are made available by the City from the taxes of the people.

The reaction on the thousands of children and students who have seen and will see this exhibition is a cause for great concern. In many of our schools and colleges, the students are being systematically indoctrinated in

the philosophy of imaginative anarchy in the creative arts. This exhibition at the Metropolitan will do much to crown the efforts being made in this direction. Achievement, in the souls of the young, is invariably measured by success, and seeing sculpture which their younger brothers or sisters might have done in kindergarten sponsored and awarded prizes by the Metropolitan Museum will go a long way toward convincing them that the shortest and easiest method to become a nationally-famous sculptor is to produce something abstruse or sensational.

Unfortunately, by destroying an ideal of beauty, endeavor, and discipline in the artistic expression of a people, the very foundations upon which its national achievement rest, are being undermined. The so-called "Modern" artists claim that they represent the New Age, and the tremendous changes it has brought. We most heartily repudiate this claim, in the name of the sound, normal American people.

History demonstrates that no period has been free of change and conflict, but the greatness of any people has always depended on the positive expression they gave every form of national life. There have always been victims of psychopathic delusions, who torment themselves with visions of an agonizing, sordid, or abstract character, and there have always been spiritual prostitutes, prepared to take advantage of any conjunction for the sake of fame or notoriety.

In antiquity, a fame-sick man burned down a famous temple in order to become immortal; and the very active campaign being waged in art today by a small group of people, strong in the negation of every established form of artistic representation, is no less ambitious or destructive.

Such an influence can but prove deeply deteriorating in a period in which American democracy is attacked from every angle by a philosophy of Totalitarianism which has permeated nearly every country in continental Europe. And in every country which fell a victim to this insidious ideology, Modernistic art proved a most effective vanguard.

When all the gods have been discredited and cast down, and confusion reigns as to all life's values, the people in their helplessness will accept almost any idol which is set up with a sufficient blare of trumpets and show of conviction.

We not only regret the ridicule and criticism which this exhibition has brought upon the Metropolitan Museum, and sculpture, but we are deeply concerned over the far-reaching repercussions which such a policy on the part of the Museum, if continued, must have not only on art, but on our national life and character.

NATIONAL SCULPTURE REVIEW:

"A Special Committee of the National Sculpture Society, appointed at request of a general meeting and with the unanimous approval and authorization of a meeting of the Council, sent a letter to the Trustees and Director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art regarding the selection of the Jury of Awards and the awards made in its recent sculpture exhibition, 'American Sculpture, 1951.' Copies were sent to the membership, (Professional, Allied Professional, and Patron), to the press, and to a broad cross-section of leaders in all fields, (several thousand in all), asking for co-signers thereto or comments.

Mr. Donald De Lue, Chairman, reports that to date (February 18th) 1,227 have replied. Of these 906 have accepted as co-signers, 111 have signified general approval but declined to sign for a variety of reasons, and 210 have given emphatic "no's."

Proponents of the modernistics, and the vociferous band of admirers in the ranks of the critics, should ponder these figures. Americans seem still to have an unshaken belief in "beauty, integrity, and craftsmanship." When 82.8%, counting those for, but not signing, are on our side, we take renewed courage.

The Special Committee wishes to thank everyone who has responded, from north, east, west and south, for the splendid support given in authorizing the use of their signatures on the letter of protest. The response has been so overwhelming that it is physically impossible for them to express to each person individually their appreciation for the many interesting letters and cards, which help to make up probably the greatest expression of public opinion on art ever voiced in America." (Reprinted from the Editorial page of the National Sculpture Review, Vol. 1, No. 2, p. 5, March, 1952)

THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART:

A recent protest from the National Sculpture Society to the Metropolitan Museum of Art against the Metropolitan's current sculpture exhibition has come to the attention of the Museum of Modern Art. Since this protest deals with modern art, the subject to which this Museum is dedicated, and since this Museum is mentioned in it, we feel that some comment is in order. We believe in anyone's right to protest, but we also believe that attacks based on tendentious misrepresentations cannot be left unanswered.

By attacking for its modern character an exhibition which in fact repre-

sents every tendency in contemporary American art from the advanced to the most conservative, the letter reveals itself as an instrument for a group that does not want to see all trends represented in a national exhibition but tries to impose its taste on the museums and the public—a practice that is violently denounced in this same letter.

The letter resorts to the time-worn practice of linking modern art with left wing tendencies, when it is quite apparent that the diversity of political opinion is as great among conservative artists as among the most advanced artists. The letter calls modern art an effective vanguard to totalitarianism. This is like denouncing the valiant efforts of those countries to establish democracy because they were later overcome by dictatorship.

The letter also claims that a group of artists has "taken over the Museum of Modern Art, which was planned for contemporary, not predominantly modernistic art." This is not true. In the Museum's first publication in 1929, the terms "modern movement" and "progressive phases of painting and sculpture" were used in describing the Museum's field of activities, which proves conclusively that the Museum from its inception was dedicated to the more advanced movements.

It is fortunate that the attack on the Metropolitan's exhibition does not reflect the opinion of the majority of people interested in art, nor even of all the members of the National Sculpture Society. We are happy to join with Cecil Howard, one of the best known conservative sculptors and a prominent member of the Society, in his recently published statement about this exhibition: "It is well to give a free hand to experimentation and the search for new forms of expression."

THE WHITNEY MUSEUM OF AMERICAN ART:

In connection with the letter, released today, being sent by the National Sculpture Society to the director and trustees of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, in regard to the Museum's current exhibition, "American Sculpture 1951," the following statement has been issued by the Whitney Museum of American Art:

The Whitney Museum does not usually reply to public criticisms, but the letter from the National Sculpture Society involves special circumstances which make a reply necessary. The letter is not only completely misleading artistically, but injects false political issues and has been broadcast to several thousand prominent individuals outside the art world and unfamiliar with the background and facts. These individuals are probably not aware that the letter

originated with the most conservative wing of one of the most conservative societies in the art world.

As to the protest against the Metropolitan Museum's exhibition, it is obvious to anyone not blinded by prejudice that the exhibition is a sincere attempt to represent the chief tendencies of contemporary sculpture from conservative to advanced. The fact that three of the six members of the Jury of admission and one of the two sculptor members of the Jury of Awards are fellows of the National Sculpture Society, and that 23 of the 101 sculptors exhibited are fellows or members, is sufficient evidence that the writers of this letter are not actually interested in artistic freedom, but in control of the art world by themselves and in exclusion of other sculptors whose viewpoints differ from theirs.

The attack on what the writers call the "Modernistic Movement" shows a ludicrous ignorance of contemporary art. In speaking of "a left-wing art group which has grown . . . to menace in the art world," the writers evidently mean a large proportion of their fellow sculptors, representing the most diverse viewpoints, and including many individuals of established reputation, recognized by other artists' societies and by museums and critics throughout the country. This attempt to label as "left-wing" all sculptors outside their own narrow viewpoint reveals the extreme bias of the writers of this letter. The implication that any particular "group" is conspiring to seize control of Metropolitan Museum or any other museum, is nonsense.

The linking of so-called "Modernistic" art with political totalitarianism is a complete reversal of the truth. The writers either do not know, or choose to falsify, the historic fact that all totalitarian governments, whether fascist or communist, have ruthlessly suppressed liberal and advanced art, along with all other expressions of individualism, and have permitted only art of the most conservative type. Such a distortion of historic facts for propaganda purposes is a curious echo of the tactics used by communist and Nazi propagandists in attacking modern art.

As to the statement that "a very active group of artists" has "complete possession of the Whitney Museum for their experimental work," we wish to say that the museum has exhibited the works of several hundred American sculptors of many differing viewpoints and styles, conservative, liberal and advanced; that its chief claim is to exhibit and acquire the best in contemporary art regardless of tendencies; and that no "group of artists" has any control of its policies. Although the Museum disregards the individual artist's affiliations, many members of the National Sculpture Society have been included in its exhibitions, and will continue to be.

We sincerely hope that this hysterical attack from a small fanatical section of the art world will not effect the Metropolitan Museum's continuance of exhibitions of contemporary American art organized on a broad democratic basis.

The Whitney Museum of American Art
 FLORA WHITNEY MILLER, President
 HERMON MORE, Director
 LLOYD GOODRICH, Associate Director

THE COLLEGE ART ASSOCIATION:

We, the undersigned Directors of the College Art Association of America, elected by its 2,034 members to represent them in questions of general interest, take grave exception to the character of the protest issued by your Society to the Metropolitan Museum of Art. We do not question the right of your Society to protest the awards recently made by the Metropolitan Museum for works exhibited in its show of American Sculpture, 1951. We do, however, most strongly question a protest couched in phraseology both misleading and mischievous.

We refer specifically to the linking of what you call "Modernistic" art to totalitarian ideologies, first by association through the use of the phrase "left-wing", which suggests a political as well as an artistic position, and second by overt statement when you refer to "Modernistic" art as an "effective vanguard of totalitarianism".

While it is true that "Modernistic" art has preceded totalitarian regimes, it is equally true that conservative art preceded totalitarian regimes. The membership of the National Sculpture Society must surely be aware that it is wholly arbitrary to imply any causal connection between these events. The freedom of artists in the 1920's in Germany to be as modern or conservative as they pleased, cannot properly be termed as "effective vanguard of totalitarianism". It is altogether possible that some of the 608 persons who signed your protest (of the 4,700 persons who were asked to sign it) did so without knowing that totalitarian governments always suppress liberal and advanced art and only permit art of the most conservative type. Hitler ruthlessly destroyed what he called "degenerate art" and forcibly established a type of art suitable to the demands of the Nazi party.

As Directors, we represent an association devoted to the study, practice and criticism of art of all places and ages, including the present. Our members, from the colleges, universities, art schools, and museums of America, place the highest value on the individual's freedom of visual expression, as well as on his freedom of speech and conscience. We contest any attempt to abridge that freedom by false association of one trend in contemporary art

with a generally abhorred political movement. We are glad to notice that our concern over the assertion of such a connection is shared by some members of the National Sculpture Society itself.

Very truly yours,

S. LANE FAISON, JR., *President*

Philip R. Adams, Director, Cincinnati Art Museum
Roberta M. Alford, Acting Director, Rhode Island School of Design
H. Harvard Arnason, Chairman, Department of Art, University of Minnesota
Myrtilla Avery, Professor Emeritus, Wellesley College
Franklin M. Biebel, Director, The Frick Collection
Jean Charlot, University of Hawaii
Walter W. S. Cook, Director, Institute of Fine Arts, New York University
John P. Coolidge, Director, Fogg Museum of Art
Walter L. Creese, Professor, University of Louisville
Marian B. Davis, Professor, University of Texas
Mark Eisner, Member of Bar, Former Chairman Board of Higher Education,
City of New York
S. Lane Faison, Jr., Head of Art Department, Williams College
Walter W. Horn, Professor, University of California, Berkeley
Henry R. Hope, Chairman, Fine Arts Department, Indiana University
George Kubler, Professor, Yale University
Alden F. Megrew, Head of Art Department, University of Colorado
Millard Meiss, Professor, Columbia University
Agnes Mongan, Curator of Drawings, Fogg Museum of Art
Charles R. Morey, Marquand Professor Emeritus, Princeton University
Erwin Panofsky, Professor, Institute for Advanced Study
Andrew C. Ritchie, Director, Department of Painting and Sculpture, Museum
of Modern Art, New York
David M. Robinson, Professor Emeritus, Johns Hopkins University
Paul J. Sachs, Professor, Harvard University
Laurence Schmeckebier, Director, Cleveland Institute of Art

THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF ARTS:

The undersigned Trustees of The American Federation of Arts wish to express their support of the Trustees and the officers of The Metropolitan Museum of Art in the recent controversy caused by the letter recently circulated by the National Sculpture Society in regard to the Museum's exhibition, "American Sculpture—1951"

Differences on art questions are normal and inevitable in the art world and should be respected. On the other hand, the writers of the letter referred

to above, by injecting irrelevant ideological and political charges in their letter and by circulating it, for signature to several thousand persons with little connection with the art world and not fully aware of the issues involved, have engaged in a campaign which tends improperly to discredit a highly responsible art institution and to limit the freedom of artistic expression.

We wish to express the sincere hope that attacks of this nature will not affect the Metropolitan Museum's constructive program and similar programs in the field of American art.

H. Harvard Arnason

Alfred H. Barr, Jr.

Paul Hyde Bonner

Leslie Cheek, Jr.

Ralph F. Colin

Russell Cowles

Sumner McK. Crosby

George H. Fitch

Lloyd Goodrich

Rene d'Harnoncourt

Bartlett H. Hayes, Jr.

Earle Ludgin

William M. Milliken

Grace L. McCann Morley

Elizabeth S. Navas

Roy R. Neuberger

Thomas Brown Rudd

Charles H. Sawyer

James S. Schramm

Lawrence M. C. Smith

Eloise Spaeth

Hudson D. Walker

SCULPTOR'S GUILD:

The members of the Sculptors Guild at a general meeting held on March 27 discussed the letter recently circulated by the National Sculpture Society attacking the Metropolitan Museum's exhibition, "American Sculpture 1951." By a unanimous vote we wish to state that we consider it a signal disservice to contemporary sculpture.

A quick glance at the actual exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum would have made it obvious to anyone that the charge concerning the make-up of this exhibition was totally false. The Sculptors Guild feels particularly that attaching political labels to modern trends can do great injury to sculpture now and in the future. It can only exasperate the museums, alienate the architects, frighten the public, and end by harming all sculpture, both traditional and modern.

We feel that it is perfectly possible to blend all trends of sculpture, from traditional to non-objective, as evidenced in the congenial combination of work exhibited yearly by our organization.

Yours very truly,

CLEO HARTWIG,
Executive Secretary
Sculptors Guild, Inc.

ARTISTS EQUITY:

Artists Equity Association, a nationwide organization of over two thousand artists, at its annual national delegates meeting held March 28-29 in Philadelphia, authorized issuance of a strong protest against the character of your attack on the exhibition of sculpture held this winter at the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

We are an organization formed by professionals for mutual protection and advancement of the interests of all professionals of whatever medium, locality or school. As such we especially deplore so violent an attack of professional artists on their fellows and on a friendly institution so important to the advancement of art. Facing the same problems, talking the same language, emerging from the same tradition, we feel that artists should be able to confer coolly and intelligently on any genuine issues or injustices in the professional field.

Especially reprehensible was the attempt to try your case in the press and before the general public. Such avoidance of a proper forum on a professional issue would seem to indicate a feeling that the matter would not be decided in your favor by those who were adequately informed, so you have presented yourselves before those you hoped would be awed by your apparent professional authority.

Perhaps the most vicious aspect of the attack was your self-interested attempt to confuse the lay public by fantastically distorting the ideological background of "modern" art. Nothing could be more undemocratic than your insistence that only your own taste prevail. Nothing could be more foreign to the American tradition than your demand that change and growth be condemned as destructive. Nothing could be more unpatriotic than the way you besmirch the holy concept of love of country by dragging it into your selfish and panic stricken attempt to stifle competition.

The exhibitions of contemporary American art at the Metropolitan Museum represent an important step in the policy of the institution. They are of great value to the living American artist and the living tradition of American art. Artists Equity will continue to work constructively with the directors of the Museum to develop the greatest potentialities of this program.

Very truly yours,

Artists Equity Association
HENRY BILLINGS,
President

Obituaries

MARGUERITE FALBORD

The untimely death of Marguerite Robertine Falbord in Paris on October 14, 1951 has deprived the world of archaeology of one of its most brilliant and profound scholars. Although Miss Falbord was only 37 years old, she had already an impressive series of degrees and academic honors. These included a B.A. from New York University, an M.A. from Radcliffe and Harvard, a Ph.D. from the same institutions and an additional Ph.D. from Columbia University. Her field of concentration was Medieval Christian Philosophy and Art.

Marguerite Falbord was a woman of high intellectual achievement, fine character and personal charm. Beyond this, she was a devout Christian who saw the beauty of this world as a dim reflection of the eternal and boundless beauty of the Creator. It was her deep spiritual capacity which inspired her life and her work.

Assisted first by a fellowship to the Cite Universitaire in Paris from Columbia University and subsequently by the patronage of Pius XII Institute in Florence, Italy, Miss Falbord has been abroad for several years perfecting a doctoral thesis of unusual significance and profundity, *The Genesis Reliefs of the Cathedral of Orvieto*. This work was expected by authorities in the field to throw new light on the History of Medieval Art, for Miss Falbord was convinced that

these reliefs which had heretofore been attributed to Lorenzo Maetani, had been done by French sculptors. Her intense research on the subject was assisted by the Minister of Public Instruction in Rome and the President of Opera del Duomo in Orvieto, both of whom were tremendously enthusiastic about her discoveries. These studies were not confined to Orvieto but included the Vatican Archives and the Pathological Institute of Antique Books in Rome and at the time of her death, she was in Paris for the purpose of precisising certain details of the thesis. It was generally known that the great French Medievalist, M. Marcel Aubert, was interested in the future publication of her research.

When the news of Marguerite Falbord's death became known, many letters poured in to Pius XII Institute Florence, Italy where she had been working . . . letters which testified to the unusual regard which experts in her field and others with whom she had come in contact in the course of her career had held for her and her work. Perhaps the finest tribute was that of Reverend Edward M. Belowski, St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, New York, who said. . . "In the many activities of mortal existence her spiritual life came first. It is my opinion that the life of this great scholar was a shining example of moral beauty."

ETHEL J. GOOD

News Reports

CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA COLLEGE OF ARTS AND CRAFTS

The forty-sixth annual Summer Session will begin July 1, continuing to August 8. The six weeks' session will feature an integration of art, crafts and general education courses. Two guest instructors will teach courses in crafts. Weaving will be taught by Trude Guermontprez, and metal and jewelry will be taught by Victor Ries. For information address the Director of Admissions, California College of Arts and Crafts, Oakland 18, Calif.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY MUSEUM

An exhibition of Chinese Ceramics opened March 14 and ran through April 27. This exhibition was probably the largest and most important of its type ever shown in this country, comprising a total of 381 items which illustrated the complete development of Chinese ceramics from the prehistoric period, ca. 2500 B.C., to the end of Ch'ien Lung, 1796 A.D. Virtually every phase of Chinese ceramics within these periods was shown. The exhibition was under the direction of Henry Trubner, Curator of Oriental Art.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

On view at the Stanford Art Gallery, May 27—June 22, "Paintings from Great Britain", a representative group of British paintings covering many periods from Romney and Reynolds to the present day; from June 27-August 24, "Paintings from the Permanent Collection of the University."

CONNECTICUT

YALE UNIVERSITY

An exhibition of 14 recently cleaned Italian Renaissance paintings from the

Jarves Collection was held at the Yale University Art Gallery, March 25-May 18. The program was started more than two years ago under Andrew Petryn, Research Assistant in Conservation, and Charles Seymour, Jr., Associate Professor of the History of Art and Curator of Renaissance Art. . . . A Civic Art Conference was held at Yale, April 24 and 25, under the chairmanship of Christopher Tunnard, Director of Yale's Graduate Program in City Planning. The conference centered attention mainly on the artistic possibilities in civic work today. It closed with a Bromley Lecture on "Thomas Jefferson and Civic Art" by Fiske Kimball, Director of the Philadelphia Museum of Art and the Jefferson Memorial Foundation.

Yale University's Norfolk Art School will open its annual summer session on August 4 on a completely reorganized basis. The new set-up will provide an intensive program for students with at least two years of previous training in art schools or liberal art colleges and universities. Instruction for beginners will be eliminated entirely. Raymond B. Dowden, Professor of Design at Cooper Union, will serve as Director of this year's session. Applications for entrance and requests for further information should be addressed to Mrs. Lees Brown, Secretary of the Department of Design, Yale School of Fine Arts.

GEORGIA

WESLEYAN COLLEGE

The first annual "Festival of Contemporary Arts" was held by the School of Fine Arts during February. It was planned through the combined efforts of the faculties of art, music, and the theater, under the Chairmanship of John H. Hruby. Included on the program were lectures, panel discussions, demonstrations, and exhibitions. Emil Holzhauser,

Gerhard Bosch, and Gulnar Bosch of the art faculty, acted on the Committee.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION announces the publication of the sixth edition of *American Universities and Colleges*, and the third edition of *American Junior Colleges*. For information, address the Council at 1785 Massachusetts Avenue N.W., Washington 6, D.C. . . . GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY—An exhibition of sculpture and silver craft by Donald C. Kline and paintings by Alfred H. McAdams, both graduates of George Washington, was shown in the University Library from May 2 through May 29. NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR HISTORIC SITES AND BUILDINGS offices are now located at 712 Jackson Place N.W., Washington 6. The American Federation of Arts' Washington branch office has reoccupied its quarters in Octagon House.

ILLINOIS

ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Herbert Pinzke, Zeke Ziner, and Vera Burdick, instructors in the evening school at the Institute of Design, exhibited work from April 22 to May 2 at the college. . . . Modern painting and design applied to everyday living were the themes of an exhibit May 7-9 at the Institute of Design. The building was open to visitors during all three days of the annual Open House.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Urbana Campus — Seven paintings from the "1952 Exhibition of contemporary American Painting" have been purchased for the University's permanent collection. Sharing the purchase awards are Rufino Tamayo, *People Contemplating Birds*; Carlyle Brown, *Table with Glasses and Roses*; William G. Congdon, *Assisi No. 1*; Samuel Adler, *Mauve Still Life*; Carol Blanchard, *Late Again*; Walter Murch, *The Motor*; and Tom Ben-

rimo, *Pastorale*. On the Jury of Awards were Profs. C. V. Donovan, C. W. Briggs, Nicholas Britsky, G. N. Foster, J. D. Hogan, E. C. Rae, J. R. Shipley, and A. S. Weller. The seven prizewinners for this year bring the contemporary painters included in the University's collection to 46. An exhibition of the complete permanent collection is planned for next fall. *Chicago Division*—The "Eliel Saarinen Memorial Exhibition," originated at the Museum of the Cranbrook Academy of Art and circulated by the AFA, was shown at the University Art Gallery, April 5-26.

INDIANA

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

An exhibition on "The Animal in Chinese and Japanese Art" prepared by Professor Theodore Bowie of the Fine Arts Department, was shown at the Art Center, March 23-April 9. An excellent catalog is available. . . . Contemporary paintings, sculpture, and prints from the collection of Mr. & Mrs. Henry R. Hope were shown at the Toledo Museum of Art through March 9.

JOHN HERRON ART INSTITUTE

Commencement exercises were held at the John Herron Art School on June 1 with an address by Mr. William M. Milliken, Director of the Cleveland Art Museum. Diplomas and degrees were awarded to 26 graduates, including three Master of Fine Arts degrees for advanced work. James Snodgrass, fifth year painting graduate, was awarded the \$1200.00 Mary Milliken Memorial Scholarship for travel in Europe during the summer months. Snodgrass also won the top prize in the recent 45th Annual Indiana Artists Exhibition at the Herron Museum.

KANSAS

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE

The Friends of Art Executive Committee announces the following purchases from the "Second Biennial Exhibition of Regional Paintings" at Kansas State,

March 30—April 20. To Kansas State College: *Temple Landing*, Don M. Beardsley; *Bridge*, John Basher; *Overcast Sky*, Norman Eppink; *Lantern*, Robert O. Hodgell; *River Lights Grey*, John Paul Jones; *Equestrian*, J. Jay McVicker; *Red Tiles*, James Penney; *Wind and Time*, Doel Reed. Paintings were also purchased by the First National Bank, Manhattan; by a Kansas State student; and by a Junction City art teacher. The exhibition contained eighty paintings and two pieces of sculpture.

MASSACHUSETTS

MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE

The Elizabeth N. Watrous Gold Medal and \$300 was awarded Professor Henry Rox of Mount Holyoke College at the 127th annual exhibition by the National Academy of Design in New York for his kneeling figure *St. Joan of Arc*. Mr. Rox was also represented in the Metropolitan Museum's "American Sculpture 1951" by his work *Arise*.

MICHIGAN

DETROIT INSTITUTE OF ARTS

An international competition for new designs in carpeting, offering \$2,000 in prizes, is announced by the Arthur Fleischman Carpet Company of Detroit in cooperation with the Detroit Institute. Entries must be submitted by January 1, 1953. The jury includes: Dr. E. P. Richardson, Charles Nagel, Hollis S. Baker, Charles Eames, Belle Krasne, Eero Saarinen, and Frank Masland. Entry forms giving details of the competition may be obtained by writing the Competition Committee, Arthur Fleischman Company, 12585 Gratiot Avenue, Detroit 5, Michigan. . . . A series of four lectures planned as a "Preview for Europe" were given in April and May by Marvin Schwartz. Designed especially for those planning summer tours of Europe, the lectures reviewed the art treasures in major European cities. . . . A program for Detroit club women, intended as an aid to future program planners, was

held April 29. A brief survey of the resources of the Institute was offered along with suggestions for single art programs and for series.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

"The 6th Annual Exhibition of the Michigan Water Color Society" is being held June 1-29, at the University of Michigan Museum, Ann Arbor. This is a juried show.

MINNESOTA

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

During April, "Master Prints of the 19th and 20th Centuries" from the collection of Mr. & Mrs. Richard Davis, were shown at the University Gallery.

MISSOURI

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Two new publications on the faculty and program of the School of Fine Arts, Washington University, St. Louis, are now available. Address inquiries to Dean Kenneth Hudson, at the above address.

NEBRASKA

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

Purchases made for the F. M. Hall collection and the Nebraska Art Association collection from the recent "62nd Annual Exhibition," March 2 through March 20, were as follows: F. M. Hall purchases, *Wildboden*, Ernst L. Kirchner; *Woman of the Crucifixion*, Rico Lebrun; *Man in the Open Air*, Elie Nadelman; *The Five that Escaped*, Randolph Johnston; *Cross Camp Island*, William Keinbusch; #2, Ad Reinhardt; plate and vase, Carlton Ball. Nebraska Art Association purchase, *The Italian Girl*, Mitchell Jamieson. New acquisitions for 1951-52 were shown during April.

NEW YORK STATE

CHAUTAUQUA SUMMER SCHOOL ART CENTER

The Center, in session June 30-August 22, offers courses accepted for credit at New York University's School of Edu-

cation. The Art Center is under the direction of Revington Arthur.

NEW YORK CITY

THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF ARTS

Main offices now at 1083 Fifth Ave., New York 28. . . . The United States will be represented this year in the "Twenty-sixth International Biennale Art Exhibition" in Venice June 14-October 19, by the work of four American artists: Alexander Calder, Stuart Davis, Edward Hopper, and Yasuo Kuniyoshi. The selection of the artists and the assembling of the works of art for the American Section of the Exhibition was assigned to the AFA by David E. Finley, appointed by the Department of State as United States Commissioner to the Biennale.

THE ART STUDENTS LEAGUE

The Annual Costume Ball of the Art Students League was held on Friday, April 18, at the Waldorf-Astoria, in a concerted effort to raise funds for Scholarships.

STEPHAN LION GALLERY

This gallery devoted to art for advertising, opened in New York on April 14, with the first American showing of the work of Hans Erni.

OHIO

CLEVELAND INSTITUTE OF ART

Prizes and scholarship awards amounting to a total of \$6,000 were announced at the annual commencement exercises for the graduating class on May 30, 1952. Heading the list were the \$1,250 Agnes Gund Traveling Scholarship to Harry Richardson, two \$1,000 Mary C. Page Scholarships went to Merle Edelman and Robert Brisley, and Graduate Fellowships of \$450 each went to Robert Bidner, Donald Johnson, Richard Anuszkiewicz, and Sally Horvath. The R. Henry Norweb prize of \$250 for sculpture went to Lawrence Reiter and the similar \$250 ceramic prize went to Dorothy Nelson.

William McVey and Louis Bosa are included among the visiting artists for the 1952 Summer Session.

CLEVELAND MUSEUM OF ART

The Art Museum reports an attendance record of over 125,000 at its annual May Show of local artists' work this year with sales of 1,445 works of art selling to a total of \$28,870.

OBERLIN COLLEGE

An exhibition of the recent paintings of Robert Reiff, member of the faculty of the Fine Arts Department, was held at the Allen Art Museum, April 15-30. . . . Robert Motherwell conducted the third Baldwin Seminar on "The Ideas and Rejections of Modern Art," April 15-24, and gave two public Baldwin lectures. In connection with his visit, twenty paintings by the artist were on view at the Allen Art Museum, April 15-May 12.

RHODE ISLAND

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

The Summer Art Workshop will be held July 7-August 15. For information, write to Director of Summer School, University of R.I., Kingston, R.I.

VIRGINIA

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

When the Virginia Museum's traveling exhibition on serigraphs for children was on display at Mary Baldwin College, students in the University of Virginia Extension Class in Basic Art purchased a silk screen print from the exhibition and presented it to the Woodrow Wilson High School in Fishersville.

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY

Marion Junkin, head of the Art Department, is now working on a 9' x 37' fresco for the University Library. Its theme, "The Struggle for a Free Mind." He is also planning frescoes for the Virginia State Police Headquarters and the new hospital in Lexington.

WASHINGTON

UNIVERSITY OF
WASHINGTON

From April 20 through May 11, a student exhibition of paintings and sculpture by students of the school of art was shown at the Henry Gallery. The show was juried by students. From March 26 through April 16, a civic art center project was presented by the School of Architecture and co-sponsored by the Seattle Civic Center Association and the City Planning Commission. The project was shown in the Henry Gallery.

FOREIGN NEWS

DENMARK

AMERICAN GRADUATE SCHOOL in Denmark has announced that the University of Copenhagen and the University of Aarhus have organized a series of courses and seminars in English at the Danish Graduate School for Foreign Students, Copenhagen, September, 1952-April, 1953. Courses include: Nordic archaeology, by Therkel Mathiasen, deputy curator, National Museum, Copenhagen; Eskimo culture and language, by Erik Holtved, professor, University of Copenhagen, and Helge Larsen, deputy curator, National Museum. Address the American Graduate School in Denmark, 588 Fifth Ave., New York 19.

GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. Raymond Lister has been commissioned to write a book on silhouettes and he is most anxious to trace any important collections in the United States in public or private hands, also any practising silhouettists. Address Mr. Raymond Lister, Linton Thatch, Linton, Cambridge, England. **ATTINGHAM PARK** will conduct a National Trust Summer School for the study of the great houses of England, July 10-July 25, followed by a week in the London area, July 23-July 31. This course will be of particular interest to American graduates concerned with English architecture, art and social history. For information write The Warden, Attingham Park, Shrewsbury.

ITALY

FLORENCE, PIUS XII INSTITUTE, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF FINE ARTS FOR AMERICAN WOMEN. Roberto Salvini, Professor of Art History, has been awarded the Cortina d'Ampezzo prize for his book, *Guida all'Arte Moderna*. Antonio Berti, Professor of Sculpture, is one of two sculptors invited to submit statues of St. Louise Marillac, in a competition sponsored by the Vatican. The statue selected is to be placed in St. Peter's Basilica, Rome. Maestro Annigoni, Professor of Drawing, plans to spend the summer in England where he will do Court portraits.

MEXICO

MORELIA, THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHOACAN—From March 30-May 3, the School of Painting of the University presented an exhibition of paintings and drawings by Hollis Holbrook and Syd Fossum. The exhibition was held at the Museum of Michoacan in Morelia. Both artists have been working in Morelia for the past year. An illustrated catalog is available.

THE NETHERLANDS

AMSTERDAM—The XVII International Congress of the History of Art is to be held in Amsterdam, July 23-31, followed by two days of excursions. Information about the Congress has been sent to the National Committee: Mr. W. G. Constable, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Dr. Walter Cook, Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, New York City; Professor Sumner Crosby, Fine Arts Department, Yale University, New Haven; Professor R. Lee, Columbia University, New York City. A preliminary program has been drawn up and may be obtained from any member of the Committee.

SOUTHEASTERN COLLEGE
ART CONFERENCE

The annual meeting of the Southeastern College Art Conference was held on the campus of Louisiana State Uni-

(Continued on page 320)

Book Reviews

George Kaftal, *St Francis in Italian Painting*, xiv + 121 pp., 39 ill., London: George Allen and Unwin, 1950. \$3.00.

For the layman this book may serve as a general if brief introduction to the early painting and literature concerning St. Francis of Assisi. For the art student and historian this book will prove inadequate and disappointing. The book is too small and incomplete to be useful as an iconographic reference. There is little or no discussion of the painting of the period, and the literary material is summarized briefly. One is left with the impression that this book is a series of excerpts and details brought together with the vague purpose of presenting an admittedly popular subject with some scholarly trimmings.

The book begins with a concise biography-essay on St. Francis, his personality, his mission, and his ideals. The author has condensed a great amount of historical material and controversial opinion. The reader will be interested to know that Mr. Kaftal presents the view of a modern Roman Catholic. The main part of the book is devoted to thirty-nine plates illustrating scenes from the life and miracles of St. Francis. The plates are selected from Italian painting depicting the Franciscan legend from the XIII to the XV century. Opposite each plate there is a quotation from one of the several early biographies of the saint. There are references in the appendix to the works of reputable art historians whose opinion the author follows.

There is a confusion in the first four scenes as the plates do not illustrate the text opposite. This confusion is partially resolved by the insertion of an *Errata* sheet at the first plate. Beginning with the sixth scene and continuing thereafter the quotation on the left hand page is

illustrated by the plate on the right hand page. The selection of plates follows no art historical order and no one cycle of the Franciscan legend is fully illustrated. The author has been led by the desire, evidently, to choose a quotation whenever possible from the earliest literary source. Thus selections from the first biography of St. Francis by Thomas of Celano (ca. 1230) and the second biography by the same author (ca. 1247) are used in support of illustrations from paintings produced long after the Celano biographies had been suppressed and condemned officially by the Franciscan order. The *Legenda Maior* by St. Bonaventura stood as the authorized biography of St. Francis after 1266, and subsequent painting, in general, derived its literary source from St. Bonaventura's work. St. Bonaventura's *Legenda* borrows heavily from the Celano biographies, so that one might argue that it makes little difference which account is quoted. But the change in interpretation and emphasis, and the details that are added or suppressed in the *Legenda Maior* constitutes some of the very same changes which can be observed in Italian paintings depicting the Franciscan legend in the late XIII and early XIV centuries. To pair the earlier text with the later painting destroys the known historical connection. There are several unacknowledged omissions in the quotations which accompany the plates. (The reviewer compared the quotations with the texts in "Legendae S. Francisci" in *Analecta Franciscana*, vol. 10, which includes the collated and edited versions of Celano's biographies and St. Bonaventura's *Legenda Maior*. This is more up to date [1941] than the *Acta Sanctorum* on the legends concerning St. Francis.) Kaftal has omitted (p. 90) a large part of the account in Celano's first biography of the Last Meet-

ing of St. Francis and St. Clare, and in the full account by Celano it is clear that St. Clare and the Sisters saw and embraced the stigmata on St. Francis through the small window through which they received communion. St. Bonaventura does not state explicitly that the Sisters emerged from their cloister. This idea is first presented in the Assisi fresco. In three other instances Kaftal has quoted from Celano's biographies where the St. Bonaventura account is the more explicit description of his illustration. In the quotation describing the miracle of the Liberation of the Prisoner, Kaftal omits the last two sentences from the St. Bonaventura text which explain the action of the Bishop in the Assisi fresco illustrated on the opposite page. A typographical error occurs on page 118: Read "Salter" for "Salyer".

Mr. Kaftal is the author of two small books similar to this one in format and plan, one on St. Dominic, the other on St. Catherine of Siena. Had *St Francis in Italian Painting* been presented with fewer scholarly overtones, one could dismiss the book as a popular offering. As presented the book reveals a limited coverage of its subject and misleading juxtapositions of illustration and text so as to impair its usefulness to readers of the COLLEGE ART JOURNAL.

WILLIAM B. MILLER
Columbia University

H. Gerson, *Van Geertgen tot Frans Hals: De Nederlandsche Schilderkunst*, deel I, 72 pp., 172 ill., Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Contact, 1950. 22.50 fl.

This is the first half of a publication which is intended to give a general survey of Dutch painting from the fifteenth to the end of the seventeenth century. Dr. Gerson begins with the few scattered incunabula of painting produced in what today is called Holland; he sees a continuous development only from the times of Geertgen, that is from about 1480; the volume ends with those masters who had developed their style by 1630. No

hard and fast division was evidently possible at that point and the reader will feel that without its sequel the book remains a fragment. It is to be hoped that we will not be kept waiting too long for the second part.

The chief value of the book, particularly for those who cannot read Dutch, lies in its generally excellent plates. It would be wrong, however, to neglect Dr. Gerson's thoughtful and well written introduction. He has done a skillful job with a difficult assignment. There are some serious problems involved in this task and it is obvious that Dr. Gerson is well aware of them: to what extent can one speak of "Dutch" art at a time when the political unit which we call Holland did not exist? Is it possible to isolate features which are peculiar to this school? How much does it owe to foreign schools, above all those of Flanders and Italy? Furthermore can one discuss painting alone when dealing with artists such as Lucas van Leyden, Goltzius, and Seghers whose chief contributions were made in other techniques? Dr. Gerson touches on all these questions but he manages to stay on his course, so that the reader hardly notices the dangerous cliffs past which he is sailing so smoothly.

He owes the pleasant cruise to the skipper's determination to stay as close as possible to the individual work of art. Dr. Gerson's text is above all a running commentary on the plates. He writes with the assurance of a man who knows the field intimately; without being florid, he can occasionally find just the right *simile* to bring the picture to life, as for instance when he compares the angels emerging from the dark background in Geertgen's newly found Madonna on the Crescent Moon with "ice flowers on a lighted window-pane." As it may happen with any good guide who calls our attention to the fine points, we occasionally lose sight of the over-all pattern; Dr. Gerson, indeed, is more bent on characterizing individual masters and works than on speculating on the historical

causes and conditions which may have contributed to making them what they were. In this he follows his great model Max J. Friedlaender whose influence is sensed not infrequently.

Dr. Gerson shares with Dr. Friedlaender also a certain casualness towards iconographic problems (the division of the Annunciation by a pillar in pl. 34, for instance, is not "against all tradition" but rather a proof for the Virgo-master's archaic tendencies) and one could wish that the foreign sources of the style of some Dutch artists might have been identified more precisely. On the other hand, the book is—as one would expect from a scholar like Dr. Gerson—remarkably free of errors and it has, as an additional asset, a selective bibliography for each chapter with valuable references to recent literature, especially on controversial points. (Two captions of the plates need resetting: pl. 3 is a Nativity, not an Adoration of the Magi; pl. 30 a Crowning with Thorns, not a Flagellation.)

The choice of the 172 plates must have been quite a problem, considering the vast material at Dr. Gerson's disposal at the Institute of Art History at The Hague where he is sub-director. While a good many of the pictures reproduced are little known, Dr. Gerson has been well advised to avoid bringing "novelties" at any price. He rather selected what may be called keywords and he seems to have given precedence, wherever possible, to works with dates. His book is all the more valuable as an atlas of Dutch painting because a good many artists are given prominence who have often been slighted (such as Dirk Barentsz and Heemskerck, for instance), thus giving a better idea of the variety of Dutch art than can be found elsewhere in such surveys. American readers may be pleased to know that of this carefully weeded material about one-tenth is from American collections.

In the face of the remarkable service Dr. Gerson has rendered, it may seem like ingratitude to question the balance

of the plates. The earlier masters, however, are clearly favoured over the later ones. There are 10 plates for Lucas van Leyden, 9 for Heemskerck, 8 for Scorel, 6 each for Mostart and Engelbrechtsen, while Bloemaert, Honthorst, Goltzius, C. Cornelisz, Lastman, Wittewael, to mention but a few, are represented with only one piece each; others, such as the surely underrated Moreelse, Pynas, Poelenburgh, and J. G. Cuyper are absent altogether. The cause for this "un-balance" lies to a certain extent in the plan of the book which proceeds by masters until ca. 1560/70 and by subject-categories from there on. Yet, it seems to me that there might be more involved than a change in approach, a change which was partly suggested by the material itself. Dr. Gerson is not too fond of the later mannerists, or for that matter of all the artists in whom what he considers the typical "Dutch" virtues are submerged under foreign influences. By collecting the very cautiously distributed phrases, I gather that Dr. Gerson considers as Dutch characteristics "a feeling for simple, beautiful color," for "tone," a "sense for the intimate view of nature," the "naïve spinning out of a narrative," the "love of the small" or the "decorative detail" and a "certain lack of action" or of "organization and drama." He clearly prefers what may be called "pictorial" values, texture, *facture*, the happy placing of a highlight and the loving rendering of a piece of bread on a platter to complex design or subject matter. This may in part be a concession to the public for which this book has been primarily written, the cultured Dutchmen who have a keen awareness of just these qualities. Yet there is the danger that an aesthetic judgment formulated in the 19th century may tempt even the experienced scholar to accept as "national constants" features which have no more significance than the very limited one of the theory of constants itself.

JULIUS S. HELD
Barnard College
Columbia University

Fiske Kimball, *Le Style Louis XV: Origine et Evolution du Rococo*, 265 pp., 274 ill., Paris: A. et J. Picard et Cie., 1949. 3500 fr.

How much alien scholars have contributed to our understanding of French 17th and 18th century art! It was a German who "discovered" Georges de la Tour. The current Poussin boom is the result of German and Anglo-Saxon enthusiasm. The biographer of François Mansart is an Englishman; another Englishman is preparing the definitive "Catalogue Raisonné" of Watteau. Fiske Kimball wrote *The Creation of the Rococo* (Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1943) because the Germans misunderstood the style, and the French had never successfully treated it as a whole.

How modest, by comparison, has been the contribution of recent French scholars! Yet their reticence is only one of the several paradoxes which characterize this field of research. Kimball's latest book presents another. *The Creation of the Rococo* went out of print a few months after publication and has been unobtainable ever since. Today, if you would read how a leading American historian differs with German historians over the interpretation of French art, you must do so in this French translation.

Essentially, *Le Style Louis XV* is identical with the earlier volume. It does contain some additions to the text and many new footnotes. Jeanne Marie has turned Kimball's precise and vivid English into clear if somewhat flavorless French. Moreover the quotations from German have likewise been translated so that this version reads more smoothly than did the original. Only the illustrations have suffered. One and all they have the tired look of late impressions.

As Kimball himself declared: "This is . . . in many regards a consciously old-fashioned book, devoted in the first instance to establishing with exactness the sequence of events, the identity and role of personalities individually concerned with them, in the genesis of the rococo and its successive transformations. . . .

To these matters, at the decisive moments, earlier scholars have given little serious study." To these matters, future scholars will need to give little serious study. So carefully has Kimball examined the original documents, so judicious has he been in drawing conclusions that it is hard to believe his book will ever be superseded as a source of factual information. In the course of gathering this information he has resurrected several all-but-forgotten masters. By introducing these new personalities he has changed the order of precedence within the long-established hierarchy of eighteenth century artists.

Kimball's main effort is to determine the essential facts and to distinguish the most important individuals and he is primarily concerned with the Rococo as a style of interior decoration. Yet he constantly suggests the developments which were taking place in architecture as a whole, and he sets forth clearly his own interpretation of the broad stylistic developments. Indeed the most original contribution of this book is his conception of the rococo not as a "last extreme phase of the baroque" but as a creative movement distinct from and comparable to the baroque. He contrasts the early years of Louis XIV when French art was coming to terms with the Roman high baroque with the last quarter of the seventeenth century when the academic tendency became dominant. It is out of the academic style that the French rococo developed. Kimball is at pains to point out how fundamentally it differed from contemporary and subsequent architecture in Germany, based as that was on Italian accomplishment. Finally he emphasizes the English origin of neoclassicism, showing how deeply French artists of the last half of the eighteenth century were impressed and inspired by the achievements of their English predecessors. The implications of these ideas are presented modestly and concisely. Yet collectively they outline a radical reinterpretation of European art during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Thus Kimball's latest book has a double importance. Within his chosen field he has uncovered the factual foundations on which all further research must be based. He has also set forth a challenging general hypothesis. Future art historians must draw a wholly different conclusion from his discoveries to support the established conceptual framework. Or else they must accept this thesis as a point of departure and explore its application to architecture and to the other visual arts even more fully than he has attempted. Thus *Le Style Louis XV* should serve as a stimulus to scholarship and particularly to French scholarship in much the same way that the writings of Kingsley Porter have been doing for thirty years, and for much the same reason.

JOHN COOLIDGE
Fogg Art Museum
Harvard University

The Mind of Henry Fuseli: Selections from his Writings with an Introductory Study by Eudo C. Mason, 374 pp., 8 ill., London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1951. 25 s.

For the past three decades the realm of the fine arts has been marked by a recrudescence of interest in Henry Fuseli (1741-1825), Swiss-born R.A., whose forceful pursuit of the austere sublime and the eccentrically daemonic to form a composite artistic idiom aroused vehement conflict among his contemporaries. Excepting, however, Mason's edition of the *Aphorisms*, translated into German as *Aphorismen über die Kunst* and published at Basel in 1944, Fuseli's leading modern critics (Federmann, Muschg, Jaloux, Wartmann, and Ganz on the continent; Piper, Todd, Grigson, and Powell in England) have, in general, confined themselves to the practising artist, and dealt meagerly with the aesthetic theorizer.

The present compilation of "all passages . . . in Fuseli's writings . . . which display vividly his distinctive qualities as a personality, critic and writer" con-

stitutes Mason's second attempt to reverse this trend. He is to be commended for making available a generous selection from Fuseli's works for the first time since Knowles's edition in 1831, and for enlarging the canon by including additional critical papers on the basis of valid internal evidence. His initial introduction offers a capacious study of Fuseli's life from the formative years at Zürich leavened by friendships with Bodmer and Lavater, through the period of autodidactic apprenticeship in Italy, to the rich culmination in England as *littérateur* and Professor and Keeper in the Royal Academy. Although Mason's concluding bibliography of works about Fuseli omits numerous relevant items, his explications of the attitudes of Goethe, Herder, and Blake towards him are of special value.

While Mason's anthological method serves excellently for the presentation of a specimen history of Fuseli's reputation, the vital insights of his scattered critical reviews and dicta, excerpts from his German and English correspondence and from his acute analysis of Rousseau's ideas (1767), it collapses when applied to the integral series of Royal Academy *Lectures* (1801-1825) that treat the history, nature, and effects of the arts. By disjoining short sentence-groups from their complementary contexts and prefixing a summarizing sentence of his own to each such cluster (pp. 201 ff.: "Is art Creation?"; "Classical precedents for some measure of blended emotional themes"; "The Disgusting in Art" etc.), Mason perverts his stated desideratum of "a minimum of ballast" and thwarts the realization of his title's intent. Critical analysis and not critical atomism was Fuseli's concern. Rarely guilty of categorizing without subsequently unifying, he made clear in these lectures that critical responsiveness derives its organic attribute from the cohesion of its interrelated data, none of which can be viewed as functioning in isolation without resultant anarchy of judgment.

Labouring under a concomitant ideological discomposure, Mason's major or-

ganization of these gleanings is controlled by the premise that through Fuseli's "stubbornly maintained classical husk" (Part Four) "non-classical impulses" burst through (Part Five). Mason never arrives at a consistently inclusive definition of "classicism," yet he hypostatizes the term into a kind of authoritarian *Urform*, and applies it ubiquitously as a touchstone in his running commentary upon Fuseli's ideas. He claims that Fuseli adhered to the "tenets of classicism" (p. 36) while creating for himself a "peculiar and heterodox brand of classical creed" (p. 37) albeit he was not "the Classical type" (p. 294). I think that this confusion stems from a failure to discriminate among the multivalent eighteenth-century aesthetic theories specifically operative in Germany and England. His contention that "where Fuseli most clearly parts company with the representative classicism of his day is his insistence that expression is more important in art than beauty—a doctrine with which he flies in the face of Winckelmann, Lessing, Reynolds and the classical Goethe" (p. 62) is typical. To imply that definitely invariable relations existed between the critical vocabularies of the two countries is oversimplifying a complex aesthetic situation without elucidating Fuseli's position.

The pandect of Fuseli's critical opinions was both pastbound and British in orientation, and endeavoured to bring the theories of Aristotle, Horace, Pliny, and Longinus into intelligible juxtaposition with those of Hobbes, Addison, Hartley, Burke, Gerard, Reynolds, Duff, and Kames. Intensely aware of the discord raging between old pieties and new urgencies in late eighteenth-century British aesthetics, he made no facile gestures towards either side, but devoted himself to the development of a balanced critical method compounded of the best of both. Materials for a preliminary evaluation of the result may be found among Mason's selections.

MARCIA EPSTEIN ALLENTUCK
Columbia University

Nikolaus Pevsner, *High Victorian Design: A Study of the Exhibits of 1851*, 162 pp., 122 ill., London: Architectural Press, 1951. 12s., 6d.

Henry-Russell Hitchcock, *The Crystal Palace*, 39 pp., 2 ill., Northampton, Mass.: Smith College Museum of Art, 1951.

These two publications, taken together, give a good review of the famous Crystal Palace of 1851 and its exhibitions. They augment and bring up-to-date the more readable *1851 and the Crystal Palace* of Christopher Hobhouse, published in 1937.

The title of Pevsner's book is rather misleading, for the design of 1851 was still basically of the early, not the mid, Victorian style. Pevsner begins with a good, brief discussion of the Crystal Palace and the circumstances which gave birth to the exhibition. The next section speaks of the design of various machines, the enthusiastic use of new materials and techniques and the manifest love of ingenuity. On page 49, the author begins to analyze the "characteristics of mid-Victorian design." The chief characteristics he lists are three—first, the use of generous, "bulgy" curves; secondly, a peculiar top-heaviness; and thirdly, "decoration in the flat or in thick relief all over all available surfaces." Top-heaviness is not a chief characteristic in the opinion of this reviewer; it merely happens to predominate in the examples chosen by Pevsner. Since the illustrations are from black and white wood-cuts, the style characteristics in color are not mentioned, though they are significant. The author's intention in analyzing the style of 1851 is commendable—he emphasizes what many students are now beginning to comprehend, that the past century's borrowing from historical styles does not mean that it produced no stylistic qualities of its own. These stylistic factors were so strong that they will usually shine through even the relatively faithful copyings of earlier styles.

Following a discussion of some of the

more important designers, Pevsner notes that a "discrepancy between the clear-sightedness in the abstract and muddled performance is a typical Victorian performance." There was, indeed, such a discrepancy in 1851, which is not easy to explain, and which, one laments, Pevsner does not clarify for us.

The reader is apt to feel that the twenty odd pages devoted to the painting and sculpture of the exhibition are not pertinent to the main thesis of the brief study. But the reader would be wrong, for not only were the designers sometimes sculptors or painters, but, according to the advanced tenets of the day, they should have been always.

One is glad to see that the importance of Henry Cole and his group is finally beginning to be recognized. Pevsner, who is somewhat bound by his earlier pronouncements on the roles played by Semper and Morris, cannot yet give the Cole circle its full measure of recognition. Nevertheless, Pevsner has made the Cole-Summerly-Journal of Design combination the motive of his little book.

Hitchcock's booklet is a portion of his yet-to-be-published treatise on 19th century British architecture. First, he ably, if briefly, discusses the early use of iron in architecture, then the genesis of the exhibition and the problems of the building committee, before giving an account of the earlier accomplishments of Paxton. The feverish period between the formulation of Paxton's plans and their acceptance is well told. Best of all, however, is Hitchcock's sensitive appreciation of the peculiarly delicate beauty of the Crystal Palace itself. He makes us see vividly the attraction of Owen Jones' polychromy, and realize its importance to the visitors of the palace. He also welds various critical appraisals of the palace as architecture into an intelligible whole, and traces briefly the immediate progeny of the great structure in Hyde Park.

G. HAYDN HUNTLEY
Northwestern University

Marshall B. Davidson, *Life in America*, 2 vols., xiv + 573 pp., 503 pp., c.1200 ill., Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951. \$20.00.

Chinese wisdom has been popularly credited with the dictum that one picture is worth a thousand words and modern psychology with the demonstration that a picture provides more information per square inch than a printed page. But since pictures are not completely self-sufficient those concerned with mass visual communication have given us the tabloid newspaper, the pictorial magazine and the hyper-illustrated book, in which the text is the smallest part of the whole. *Life in America* belongs to the last category since it devotes two thirds of its nearly thousand pages to illustrations and a third to the text. It is a monumental outgrowth of a catalogue for an exhibition under the same title held many years ago at the Metropolitan Museum, and parallels the Corcoran Gallery's recent *American Processional*, which surveys in a similarly sketchy and panoramic manner the course of American life since the discovery of the North American continent. The illustrations consist of every kind and level of pictorial medium, including maps and broadsides, and testify to the great labor which went into their discovery and selection. The soft tones of the offset process give them all the nostalgia of the Currier and Ives prints. The text is eminently readable and contains a generous amount of quotations from original and secondary documents which together with the accompanying illustrations of many contemporary events is meant to bring the reader as close to the nature and time of the events as possible. For these merits it has been praised in the public press. It will be read by thousands and browsed by many more, for it is clearly addressed to the general public.

Considering the scope and the price of the book, however, I find it somewhat disappointing. Although the illustrations are meant by their juxtaposition to sup-

plement and visualize the events described, their relation to the text is so general that most of them could be eliminated or replaced by others without requiring any important changes in the text. Conversely, the same illustrations could be used in any existing comprehensive history of the United States without extensive alterations either to the text or to the illustrations. As things stand, a brief reference to commerce in Colonial times is accompanied by a full-page portrait of a New England merchant by Copley but no mention is made in the text either of the merchant or of the portrait as such.

From the point of view of the general reader I would have preferred to have had the text written by one of the most readable modern American historians, to give the book the ring of professional authenticity and to have had Mr. Davidson use his experience as curator of American art to select the illustrations and provide them with relevant and fuller captions which would make the illustrations and their captions an integral part of the book, as best demonstrated by Mumford's *Technics and Civilization* or Hamlin's *The American Spirit in Architecture*. The occasional captions which attempt a pithy summary of the development of an idea are steps in the right direction. One wishes for many more of them, and for less ambiguous ones than that on p. 171 of the second volume, under the illustration of a tower-like skeletal framework: "ERECTING THE MUTUAL SAVINGS BANK BUILDING, 1902. Wm. L. Jenney's Home Insurance Co. Building (1883-85) in Chicago was the first skyscraper to be erected. His Leiter building (1889) also in Chicago was one of the first buildings to use a steel skeleton without self-supporting walls, thus opening a new era not only in construction but in urban life." Aside from the fact that the detail illustrating the top of the Mutual Savings Bank Building is contrary to the best that Jenney stood for, the caption does not tell who did the building or

where it is. The ordinary reader might ask why is this building so important a demonstration of the skyscraper principle. A more informed reader might ask what is a "true skyscraper" if not a tall building which uses a skeleton without self-supporting walls and would consider the reference to the Leiter building either as redundant or as an inadequate statement of the contribution of the Chicago school of architecture to the evolution of the tall building.

From the point of view of the art historian the book is disappointing also because—with the exception of occasional narrative references to artists—art is not treated as a facet of American life as are the theatre, athletics, and the development of the American slaughterhouse. The presence of reproductions of works of art would not seem to discharge the obligation to art implicit in such a general history of American life. Indeed their use purely as vehicles of narrative illustration merely perpetuates an unfortunate American tradition that looks upon art purely as a record of historical events. The absence of some discussion on the development of the arts in America—for all the occasional references to the technical contributions of some architects or the activities of painters—appears to be an unwitting realization of Panofsky's theory that the major literary and plastic arts are held by the general public in such low esteem that their discontinuation by law would not be opposed, whereas the same fate meted out to the movies would incite a revolution. It seems to the reviewer that it would not have been too great a burden if the book included in each of its main divisions a brief chapter on the principal currents of artistic taste in architecture, sculpture and painting. The addition would not do much to inform the art historian but would at least remind the general public of the existence of art as an integral part of life in America.

DIMITRI TSELOS
University of Minnesota

Thomas B. Hess, *Abstract Painting: Background and American Phase*, 164 pp., 107 ill. (12 in color), New York: Viking Press, 1951. \$7.50.

While there can be no denial that a new school of painting exists in the United States today, there is surely less agreement that the members of the group "constitute one of this country's major contributions to contemporary culture," the avowed thesis of Mr. Hess' book. On the latter point we come to him for guidance on the merits of the so-called Abstract Expressionists or for general proof of the bold claim of the preface, but our expectations are only partially fulfilled. The brilliant prose (one might almost say poetic) style of the author, his undoubted sincerity and sensitivity, his unquestionably superior knowledge of these men and their works—none of these gives us what many will look for, a reasonably clear explanation of what it is the various men are trying to do. Only in the case of Jackson Pollock at the very end of the book do we come upon the kind of developmental clarification that really helps one to understand even if not to worship.

As for the art itself, we cannot put ourselves in the position of the intolerant critics of Impressionism, post-Impressionism, Cubism, Expressionism and later movements. We must be willing to look and listen, to wait until clarification may come either of itself or with the aid of such critical works as this. If we are willing (as this reviewer certainly is) to concede that much to the new group of painters and their defenders, we must also retain the right to criticize, even adversely, and to give consideration to other contemporary painters who seem not to exist in the eyes of the *avant garde*. To restrict *Abstract Painting: Background and American Phase* to one particular group of painters in the climactic portion of the book, to "brush off" in less than a page of epilogue some very important artists, to omit even in the book's own area such men as the influential Matta, the powerfully expressive

Paul Burlin, the sensitive Philip Guston and others, seems rather unfair. Far more serious, however, is the imputation of either Marxist or reactionary tendencies to anyone who disagrees that this new form of art is the last and only word. Unquestionably there has been that kind of opposition to the Abstract Expressionists; on the other hand, honest people belonging neither to the Left nor to the Right might still not agree with the large claims made for the group. Other people besides "the Soviet art critic and the one writing for *Time* magazine" were somewhat taken aback at the American representation at the 1950 Venice *Biennale*, not realizing that what was intended was a view of the most "advanced" trends in American painting rather than the only ones.

The author of this book presents a strong case for his subject; the visceral Joycean prose used in the contemporary portion attempts to reflect the quality of the works discussed and their "from inside out" motivation. The first two parts of the book, *Qualifications, propositions, contradictions, definitions* and *Background and Paris* (the first 100 of the 158 pages of text), are clear, highly understandable and enjoyable analyses of general form ideas and different European stylistic manifestations. The former section deals with the problem of the abstract elements in the art of the past and demonstrates that picture quality has little to do with recognizability. Here, however, Mr. Hess states: "... if we know anything at all about what makes us enjoy a painting, it is that it has nothing to do with its species of subject, the accuracy with which this subject is represented, or the moral, political, or subconscious motive of the artist." Essential as it is to establish the fact that a work of art is important for itself alone, it must be noted that the author's own reactions to specific paintings often consist of allowing his subconscious free play in evoking a series of literarily very effective but basically quite personal images.

The second section makes a brief but stimulating survey of modern European painting, especially from the point of view of those influences which have been effective in the growth of modern American painting. We are often struck by acute observations such as that on Dada: "the idea was up-with-art by down-with-other-art, no questions answered," although there is a lingering feeling that the same could be said of some of our neo-Dada contemporaries who are placed within Mr. Hess' Pantheon.

The author's estimate of Soutine as the "Central European who worked in Paris to bring Expressionism to its fullest and most inspired realization" surely cannot be accepted without reservation. The only other Expressionist work shown is Kokoschka's 1940-41 *The Crab*, with a Van Gogh, Gauguin and a Munch correctly introduced for their antecedent role; the early Kokoschka, Nolde, Kirchner and other significant Expressionists do not appear. The reason, conscious or otherwise, for Mr. Hess' choice of Soutine as his leading Expressionist is found in the kind of picture which is used to illustrate this artist's work, *The Hill* of 1919, in which the critic's imagination finds all kinds of forms and suggestions, after which he says: "A few minutes later, I might have difficulty in finding some of these forms again." In these deliberately amorphous examples the author finds his greatest possibilities of suggestibility and reference to contemporary U.S. Expressionism. Just as questionable is the statement in connection with Kokoschka: "As soon as such artists stop betting their whole lives on the validity of the sensation, and look about for corroboration within craft, then they admit sensation does not justify itself." Here again one may doubt whether Kokoschka or, better, Kirchner with his belief in "closed composition," or Beckmann with his spasmodic but controlled space arrangements, could be fitted into this somewhat casual analysis. Nor can we admit that the paintings of Marc or Klee lack for "corroboration within craft."

These problems, however basic—and the occasional historical lapses—are perhaps less important than the procedure followed in the third section of the present book. This portion, entitled *Foreground and New York*, begins with a brief survey of the beginnings of American painting, leading into the twentieth century development. Mr. Hess points out how during the depression period when the WPA Art Projects sustained many painters there was in addition to the social-realist artists a group of abstractionists including de Kooning, Gorky, Pollock, Reinhardt, Brooks, Balcomb Greene and Gottlieb who were at that time beginning to find their respective ways. From this very interesting circumstance no particular conclusion is drawn, although it lends itself to interesting historical speculations. The role of the famous refugee artists is then outlined, the implication being that they offered a great stimulus to the American movement, though the author is careful to insist on the independent character of this movement and on the leading role of the United States in contemporary artistic culture. He insists that the movement is nationwide and that "New York becomes Paris for the art of its time, and also takes over Paris' tradition," a statement that is highly controversial, especially if its validity is based on one group of fairly recent painters rather than on the mass of leading creative artists—and we are not including middle-of-the-road or right-wing people.

From this point on there are relatively brief descriptions of the careers of eighteen painters who have been chosen as representative of the new painting, beginning with de Kooning and ending with Jackson Pollock, the alpha and omega of this narrative. It is in these sketches that the writing of Mr. Hess reaches climax after climax, exploding in iridescent sparks of some of the most exciting prose to be found in American criticism. Speaking of de Kooning, he says: "... the light object which was so

apparent becomes only the outlining power of its neighbor; background becomes foreground, positive changes place with negative, and with all metamorphoses the solid core of structure becomes more and more impressive yet illusive. There is no single skeleton upon which this flesh is laid; we discover a hundred supports, all equally sufficient, to a hundred aspects." The description of Pollock's style is just as stimulating. This method, very effective in transmitting to the reader a "feeling" of the painter's emotive quality, is not always so convincing in the analysis of a specific work or in the explanation of his stylistic individuality.

We are occasionally baffled by such passages as: "Tobey arrives at a philosophical statement of mythic beginnings without embarrassing disclosures of mystique, with only an 'intangible' order of space. The abstract picture becomes an involved poetic symbol—a human statement for the mid-century—and still retains its wealth of means and pictorial effects." One would have liked to see an elaboration and demonstration of this and many other propositions, for there-in would lie not only the justification for the consecration of these eighteen artists (the book's avowed purpose) but also an adequate explanation of what is going on. Here and there we are told, with great truth, that "the lines of abstract, Expressionist, and fantastic art join . . ." but again more demonstration would be welcome, if only for the purpose of indicating that there is a "school" with some points in common, that these men, however *avant garde*, are part of a movement and have every right to be considered as such. Similarly the neo-Dada aspects of the school are hinted at briefly in connection with Pollock but not developed in any way. Art-historically the most significant point made would seem to be that the so-called Abstract Expressionists brought paint and sensation into a state of equality whereas the conventional Expressionists were presumably overwhelmed by sensation. On the

other hand, the exact relationship between American and European (particularly German) Expressionism is far from realized.

We must give Mr. Hess every possible credit for a courageous and exciting presentation of these men as a group. In bringing together this material with commentaries obviously based on considerable acquaintance both with the men and their works, he has performed a valuable service. His book should be read by everyone.

BERNARD MYERS
New York

John I. H. Baur, *Revolution and Tradition in Modern American Art*, 170 pp., 199 ill., Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951. \$6.00.

It is almost as difficult to review this study of modern American Art as it must have been to write it. The many shimmering styles which, like wavelets, reflect the succession of artistic personalities, in the light of rapidly changing times, dazzle the beholder, each with its own brilliance, so that it becomes particularly difficult to observe the course of the whole. One is tempted by this volume to follow each bend in the stream of events with an explorer's eye and to go through the process of analysis and discovery for himself; not a bad thing, perhaps, to say about any book. I have wondered about the numerous soundings with which the author seeks to chart the past seventy-five years, as I wondered at them upon first examining the exhibition which presented the theme at the Brooklyn Museum during the closing weeks of 1951. Though I, or anyone else, might have preferred a stroll along the bank to this particular boat-ride, that is not the point. Here, freshly calculated, is a careful and rewarding record of the artistic deeps and shallows of the 20th century. The main channel seems to change as the current, by some unseen social force, now strengthens, now slackens. For the most part, the author notes the current objectively rather than seeks an expla-

nation of it. Indeed, though it accounts for the shifting bed of the stream, it is not evaluated in terms of good or bad, right or wrong, safe or unsafe, as much as in terms of a detached interest in its existence. It is this almost scientific attitude which helps the author (and the reader if he will allow it) through the rapids. There are plenty of rapids.

Without pushing metaphor too far, I feel that the most important quality of the writing is the author's awareness of the danger of upsetting his boat by leaning too eagerly to one side or another. "In spite of a growing emphasis on individuality, creative vision is widely shared," he notes in the preface, and continues, "A movement is the result of this sharing." Or, again, "Classification is surely necessary if we are to perceive the order underlying the great diversity of modern art . . . in defining this order we may over-simplify it and thereby seriously falsify the truth. I have tried to guard against this by keeping my categories as elastic as possible . . . and by admitting freely that much art . . . could be considered with some justice under more than one heading." It is at this point that the reader with some knowledge of present-day art is tempted to leap from the bank, hold his nose and, with one hand in salute, test the depth for himself. This is all to the good, for if the changing eddies haven't altered the contour of the bottom, the method of verification makes the chart all the more trustworthy; if there are changes, it is just as well to know of them.

For the reader who doesn't know how to swim, there is not even the offer of a safe boat-ride. The book is launched in swift currents in full recognition that "those movements which were revolutionary either in subject or in form are plainly the most important." Succeeding chapters discuss these *Revolutions in Subject* in terms of the *American Scene* and the *Machine and the Sub-Conscious* to the *Abstract Art of Today*. Having become accustomed to the motion, one almost feels that the still calm which

follows is as revolutionary as the more radical experience and so the treatment of Tradition from *Impressionism* to *Realism* and *Romanticism* is met not necessarily with a sense of repose, but with a sense of newness. And I am not certain that by this inversion of historical sequence the book does not point out the true nature of tradition by implying that it is less to be found in continuing relationships of form and content than in their relative changes.

The last three chapters (perhaps the most readable) deal with the *Artist In The Modern World, Trends and Portents* and a consideration of what is meant by Modern American Art. Perhaps it is not fair to question what a book should or should not have been, but I find in the recurrence of this problem of Americanism a distracting element. The chief investigation is the artistic change, revolution if you will, in America. To raise problems of motivation which have to do with geography seems to be less important than problems of motivation pertaining to the whole international movement of art in the 20th century. The geographical influence, the "native" American (the meaning of native is never defined) is at best but a spring welling from the fountainhead of time. This study recognizes the latter and bigger influence particularly when considering trends and portents, but it is generally subordinated to the sharper focus of local interest.

The book is one in the Library of Congress series in American Civilization and in this respect its importance is twofold: it affords at once vigorous evidence that the arts are now recognized as an integral element in civilization—a fact which historians of recent times have too often ignored; and it demonstrates the essential diversity of viewpoints which is a necessary element of a truly individualized society. So often are the cross currents of idiom and personality deplored by artists as well as laymen who wish to find in the arts of our time a pattern as orderly as that by which we

observe the arts of the past that, by focusing attention on those elements of style and content which possess images and ideas in common, rather than on an artist's whole work, the author indicates something of the way in which artists react individually yet purposefully to their common environment. The technique results in occasional repetition which, for the clarity of certain passages, is, perhaps, necessary (the reiterated descriptions of the Armory Show are a trifle monotonous, for example), but such stylistic weaknesses are more than made up for by the catholicity and clarity of the many illustrations of painting and sculpture referred to as well as by pertinent observations culled from contemporary writings to enrich the chronicle of events. Perhaps the most notable of these is the inspired observation of Leo Stein in 1925 that "the perfection of modern inventions is as nothing compared with the imperfections of our social machinery." How can the crossrip of the times be more sharply observed, or the struggle of the modern artist and critic to steer his way through it be more surely accounted for? Perfection and imperfection, inorganic and organic, inhuman and human, how can it be expected that any two individuals will weigh their permutations intellectually and emotionally the same? The ways in which modern artists in America have reacted and (to repeat) the extent to which these reactions may be broadly similar is what the author asks the reader to consider.

BARTLETT H. HAYES, JR.

Addison Gallery of American Art

Henry F. Lenning, *The Art Nouveau*, 143 pp., 55 ill., The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1951. 21 guilders.

The fact that this is the first book in English on the *art nouveau* assures its economic welfare, for many of us are interested in the early stages of modern art. The prospective reader, however, is not warned by the publisher of the

narrow scope of Dr. Lenning's study. The author restricts his field primarily to Belgian and French manifestations in the fields of decoration, architecture and the minor arts. Contemporary British and German movements are hardly more than cited in relationship to this narrow theme. Louis Sullivan is never mentioned.

The book contains seven chapters of which the first, called "The Legacy," gives the *milieu* out of which the style arose, and briefly connects elements of the new style with the painting of Van Gogh, Gauguin, Henri Rousseau, Toorop and Munch. In this chapter Dr. Lenning borrows so heavily from Pevsner's *Pioneers of Modern Design* and Burdett's *The Beardsley Period* that one wonders if Dr. Lenning has neglected to make his own investigations into the stylistic and ideological evolutions of XIXth century art in general. The second chapter discusses the principles of Henry Van de Velde as things in themselves without reference to their adoption by other late XIXth century artists, nor to their origins, except that Van de Velde is quoted as acknowledging indebtedness to Ruskin and Morris. The third chapter treats the architectural and decorative design of Van de Velde, while the following three chapters follow the spread of the style in France and Belgium with emphasis on the parts played by the display rooms of Samuel Bing and the expositions of 1900 (Paris) and 1904 (Turin). A generous proportion of the text consists of quoted descriptions of the *art nouveau* displays.

In the final chapter Dr. Lenning summarizes the positive values of the *art nouveau*, and characterizes the style "as the indispensable bridge between the XIXth century's eclecticism and the XXth century's International Style."

The chief value of this publication is that it brings together selections of the texts and illustrations of many articles from contemporary magazines. The author offers little in the way of stylistic analysis, and, indeed, expresses little

esteem for the decorative features of the style, which he refers to as an "overlay of superficialities."

G. HAYDIN HUNTLEY
Northwestern University

Alfred H. Barr, Jr., *Matisse: His Art and His Public*, 591 pp., 294 pp. of black and white ill., 23 color pl., many text ill., New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1951. \$12.50.

To write about Alfred Barr's book on Matisse I find a difficult assignment. All the reviews I have read so far have been enthusiastic and I anticipated a fully rounded study, particularly in view of my admiration for both the artist and the author. I have always taken for granted that Matisse is one of the giants of twentieth century painting, and I have always known that Alfred Barr is a pioneer in understanding the art of our century. But I was disappointed. After reading the book and studying the retrospective exhibition of Matisse's work which appeared at the same time, I found myself re-evaluating the artist's position and no longer taking his leadership for granted. What I miss in Mr. Barr's book is any concession to interpretative or qualitative criticism. The almost archeological emphasis on chronological and factual data tends to sterilize the still growing work of a living artist, for this method is only necessary when applied to the paintings of a man long dead whose past is shrouded in mystery. Then research techniques must be used which will clarify the artist's work in relation to himself, to his time and his environment. But I wonder if this method can be used as successfully for the living. Is it possible to substitute scholarly techniques of the past for an intuitive understanding of one's own era? In other words, a surfeit of footnotes and questionnaire data cannot replace Mr. Barr's own knowledge of and experience with the world Matisse lives in and the influences, artistic and otherwise, which have fashioned his art.

Perhaps the author feels that it would be hasty and unwise to estimate the status of a man's work before time has made the final decision. This may explain his impersonal and highly factual approach, but I still miss a qualitative opinion. I would have been very interested in Alfred Barr's evaluation of Matisse's basic contribution to the art of our times. Does he find him a great twentieth century innovator or, perhaps as I am beginning to wonder, is Matisse more related to the late nineteenth century in an unexpectedly bold and decorative way? How has he changed the art of our period; what has he given to it? That he is an inventive colorist, a brilliant designer, no one can question, but do these qualities necessarily exclude a more introspective and psychological approach?

On the credit side, this is still a remarkable book despite its disciplined caution. Though I would rather know more about what Mr. Barr *thinks* than what members of Henri Matisse's family *say*, I am still impressed by the vast amount of carefully culled information. All manner of curious and heretofore unknown data has been unearthed with patience and discretion. The appendices alone are worth mentioning, especially Mrs. Michael Stein's report of Matisse's astute remarks to his students. If the writing is somewhat labored, mainly one feels because the author is so conscientiously intent on presenting no detail of Matisse's development incorrectly or with bias, still the total effect of dedicated honesty puts to shame the many haphazard and indiscriminate art books of today. The wealth of documentary material is invaluable for any serious student of the present century. Reproductions of high quality both in color and black and white are plentiful and several good biographical photographs add interest to this well-designed volume. Particularly noteworthy are sections devoted to the history of Matisse collectors, the fabulous Russians, Shchukin and Moro-

sov, the American Stein clan, the late Dr. Barnes and the Dane, Johannes Rump.

I cannot emphasize too strongly what a serious and scholarly study this is, how complete and total the day by day and picture by picture account of Matisse becomes. Historians of the future will need no further guide to the details of his life and work. Circumstances surrounding the production of each important painting or sculpture are reported in great detail, and the people he knew, worked with, and taught, the critics who wrote about him, the dealers who handled his work are dealt with almost as fully as the collectors who backed him. One of the most important contributions is Mr. Barr's attitude toward the artist's sculpture. Heretofore considered mainly a painter and draughtsman, Matisse here ranks high as a sculptor, a fact further pointed up by his retrospective exhibition, where his powerful bronzes rivaled the greatest of his paintings.

It takes a very important artist indeed to survive almost six hundred pages, many of which are double column text and small type, but if vitality and brilliance of execution can do it, then Matisse is almost certain of success.

KATHARINE KUH

The Art Institute of Chicago

Merrill Jensen, ed., *Regionalism in America*, foreword by Felix Frankfurter, xvi + 425 pp., Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1951. \$6.50.

Regionalism, sectionalism, or localism is most pithily defined by the French phrase "du pays." Those who know American art will easily enough think of it as a twentieth-century phenomenon, starting with "The Eight" or The Ash Can School of 1908, dying off with the influx of the School of Paris after the Armory Show of 1913, and revived by the Stone City movement of 1930. Nevertheless, Mr. E. P. Richardson, who writes in this symposium the paper on regionalistic painting, maintains that there were always four regionalistic

artistic traditions in this country—the Puritan New England, the Dutch New York, the aesthetic-scientific Middle Atlantic, and the baroque Southern. While the existence of these traditions or schools is so, the artists in them did not practise a regionalistic art as their work was usually Europe-derived—and that is exactly why painting, of all the aspects of American culture here illuminatingly reviewed, is regionalistically the most backward. The attraction of the highly developed professional centers of Europe—it is Mr. Richardson's phrase—was too much for it. Not until the remarkable development of museums after World War I, not until to this was added the Federal Art Project in 1933, and finally not until to that was added the interest in art propagated by the colleges with their artists-in-residence and by the diffusion of college-trained art historians and art critics could American painting be said to show regionalism other than as, Mr. Richardson concludes, "a relatively superficial phenomenon," brought on as a matter of practical convenience, *not* as a result of theory.

Regionalism in architecture, reviewed by Professor Rexford Newcomb, is not theory-bred either, but American architecture is infinitely more dependent upon geography than American painting is—and hence our architecture is genuinely regionalistic. The foreign nineteenth and early twentieth-century importations of Richardson, Hunt, and McKim, Mead, and White were not very regionalistic, but adaptations from the latter firm have been, *vide* the extraordinary persistence and pervasiveness of the McKim, Mead, and White type of college building (libraries, laboratories, dormitories). There is also the current influence of New England types of Colonial architecture in Ohio and other West Central states. In sum, the history of American architecture has been mostly in the regionalistic groove, that is, sensitive to local influences. Mr. Newcomb has only to mention the development of the clapboard and the fieldstone house, the gambrel

roof, the western log cabin, the patio type of Southwestern residence, the ranch house, the prairie style of Frank Lloyd Wright and last and most importantly the skyscraper, to sweep the board for regionalism. To-day we have merely to think of our filling stations, highways, airports, to realize that the architecture for them is consistent and countrywide, and perhaps not regional since it is breaking down regional differences. But then our varied geography produces the different building styles we see and Professor Newcomb concludes that "if nature were allowed to take her course, regional differences would be far more pronounced than they are."

In politics and society is where these differences are most pronounced. In a series of equally able papers at the first part of the book Professor Fulmer Mood shows that the origin of the sectional concept goes back to the first American geography by Jedidiah Morse in 1789 and that in the study of history sectionalism commenced in the classroom of Frederick Jackson Turner. But regionalism, it is emphasized, is not cultural separatism; rather is it a creative concern with the development of the region to its maximum in cultural strength.

Then three historic regions of our country—the South, the Spanish West, and the Pacific Northwest—are reviewed from the standpoint of sectionalism. The paper on the South by Professor Simkins is one of the most absorbing in the whole book because it describes the outside forces which have come into the South and which tried to make it over from its character and then it shows how the South has either adapted them to remain more truly Southern or actually scorned them. This paper goes more deeply into psychology, politics, and sociology than the others.

Another division of this stimulating volume is that devoted to regionalism as a practical force—e.g. the TVA, the Great Lakes Cutover, and the Great Plains-Missouri Valley Region. Finally, the book closes with a discussion by

Professors Curti and Odum of the limitations and promise of regionalism, papers read—as all these papers were read—to celebrate the centenary of the founding of the University of Wisconsin.

One's general conclusion from the twenty papers is that regionalism is here to stay, and is just as necessary to our enjoyment and living as the distinctive regionalism of the French *départements* is necessary to their enjoyment, if not existence. To exist in the best human sense is to have roots and to have roots is to be regionalistic. But in age some regionalisms, like that of art or of the TVA, are babies, while others, to judge from Professor Spencer's paper on the veritism of American literature, have had regionalistic impulses from the word go, that is, for over a century.

JAMES W. LANE

Saint James, Long Island

Herbert Read, *Contemporary British Art*, 48 pp., 70 ill. (6 in color), Baltimore and London: Penguin Books, 1951. \$.85.

Reality, says Mr. Read within his forty pages of text, is not the four walls of our room, it is a mental construction. He means, of course, the reality of art. About that he is on sound ground. His premises and conclusions recall Livingston Lowes' "Convention and Revolt In Poetry." I have no bone to pick with that. But it is when Mr. Read illustrates his modern reality with sixty-four illustrations of contemporary British output—paintings, sculpture, and mobiles—that the reader almost reaches for an aspirin. It is plain that the reality the modern British artist sees is linear, anti-organic, and plastic. This is the type of vision which came from Giacometti and Picasso. It is now virtually everywhere, and Mr. Read's illustrations for the most "modern" paintings, except that his British artists in their colors or forms are less strident and more subtle and delicate, might do equally well for contemporary American art.

The basic reason why Mr. Read feels

that the present phase of modern art is viable is that it reflects the stresses and conflicts of modern society because it certainly isn't beautiful, rational, or even comprehensible. But the trouble is that "modern" art is a reflector of news, of the pains and aches, of the evils of modern society, and is not a voice, nor a welcome, nor yet a devotion to the beauties of rememberable reality. While Mr. Read sees contemporary British art as romantic by nature, since it is northern, since it is expressionistic, much the same might be said of modern American art, since it, too, is introspective and personalistic, qualities from which a romanticism descends.

In the sixty-four illustrations, Mr. Read has grouped more or less together the work of the older artists and the younger men who see things at least semi-naturalistically, and then the work of the more abstract men. This is helpful. The first type of work takes up the first thirteen pages of the black-and-whites and among them we find, not unexpectedly, fine things by Augustus John, John Nash, W. G. Gillies, Tristram Hillier, Leonard Applebee, and John Piper. Of the remaining eighteen pages of illustrations, with some exceptions in the case of Wyndham Lewis, Stanley Spencer, De Maistre, and Burra, the less said the better. They are anti-phenomenalistic with a vengeance.

The big pain which this type of art gives sensible observers is caused by the inability of the artist to see that plasticism does not have all the answers. If you are a Henry Moore, you can do things with plastic form which are perhaps enviable but only because the plastic qualities have a reference to some organic form or other. The arch-modernists in modern art are forgetting that. They have thrown overboard, after the manner of artists, who can be the most fanatical of human beings, since more than most revolutionaries they do not have to make compromises, the baby with the bath. How sterile their resultant plasticism is may be seen on many

canvases and in many sculptured pieces to-day.

JAMES W. LANE

Saint James, Long Island

James Laver, *Drama: Its Costume and Decor*, 276 pp., 216 ill., New York: Studio Publications, 1951. \$5.75.

James Laver, ed., *Costume of the Western World: Fashions of the Renaissance in England, France, Holland and Spain*, xi + 390 pp., 370 ill. (48 in color), New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951. \$12.50.

By those interested in theatre, especially in the field of stage design and costume, each book published on this subject is received with real anticipation. Mr. Laver is one of the foremost authorities on stage design. Keeper of the department of Engraving, Illustration and Design at the Victoria and Albert Museum, he is in charge of one of the very fine collections of this kind in Europe. His text is compact and rich in information, but obviously only the highlights can be touched as he himself explains when dealing with so vast a subject.

He begins with a thought-provoking search towards what he calls "a theory of the theatre." From then on each chapter is devoted to a period—from the Greek theatre to the present in England, Europe and the United States. The author's desire to draw as many illustrations as possible from the collections of the Victoria and Albert Museum, leads sometimes to his not presenting as fine an example of their work as the artists might expect. He includes a selected bibliography by subject in which we note that from the last decade fewer than ten books have been listed. It is to be hoped that the tide will turn again upward and that this book will be among many in the next decade devoted to the stage and its arts. This is the first volume to appear in a series that will eventually comprise six: *The Ancient World*; *the Beginnings of Fashion*; *Fashions of the Renaissance*; *Louis XIV*

to the
Modern
Costu
praise
his w
chapter
recogn
mainin
Blum-
olds—
Reade
Fithjo
Hollan
Each
text o
period
source
scripti
volum
ones s
source
perfect
the co
special
that th
as we
Bot
among

Antho
and
nec
Hav
\$7.

In
from
nectic
day,"
than
have
1700,
defini
Furth
beyon
and
were.
histor
be ba
Ga
rema

to the end of the Empire; Waterloo to Modern Times; Regional and Specialized Costume. Mr. Laver as editor merits high praise for the distinguished quality of his work. Himself author of the first chapter on Early Tudor, he has assembled recognized authorities to write the remaining chapters as follows: André Blum—The last Valois; Graham Reynolds—Elizabethan and Jacobean; Brian Reade—The Dominance of Spain; Fithjof Van Thienen—The great age of Holland; André Blum—Early Bourbon.

Each chapter contains a closely packed text describing the costume of the period, a bibliography of important source material, and a very detailed description of each plate of which this volume contains many very handsome ones selected entirely from contemporary sources. These fine reproductions give perfect opportunity for detailed study of the costumes and their development for specialists. But so attractive is the format that the series will appeal to lay readers as well.

Both books confirm Mr. Laver's place among the few authorities in this field.

SIMON LISSIM

The City College of New York

Anthony N. B. Garvan, *Architecture and Town Planning in Colonial Connecticut*, xiv + 166 pp., 75 ill., New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951. \$7.50.

In the year 1700, Garvan estimates from census data, there existed in Connecticut some 2100-2500 houses. "Today," he says "only some twenty, less than one per cent of the houses built, have any serious claim to origin before 1700," and of these not one can be definitely dated by documentary evidence. Furthermore, we know almost nothing—beyond a few names—of who built them, and what their ideas of architecture were. On what, then, can a reliable history of early Connecticut architecture be based?

Garvan's answer is that when meagre remains, paucity of building records, and

lack of biographical evidence conspire to make impossible the conventional kind of historical research, we must turn to demographic evidence. "The cultural origin of its people," he states, "forms the highly imperfect framework upon which any description of seventeenth-century Connecticut architecture and town planning must hang."

This kind of research produces a new kind of architectural history—one more closely akin to the ethnographic and cultural inquiries of Wertenbaker than to the structural and stylistic analyses of Isham and Kelly—and a very interesting kind of history it is. In pursuing it, one finds himself viewing architecture in its setting of "townscapes" as well as landscapes, and concerning himself with populations, soils, surveys, migrations, nucleated and spread-out villages, roads, social stratifications, husbandry, and such matters as English trading company plantations in northern Ireland in the early seventeenth century.

The author works far more with demography, aerial photos, maps, and town surveys than with the customary records of building history. Indeed, he justly feels that "a critical examination of both European and American surveys may eventually reshape our concept of society in the seventeenth century." This fresh method of investigation produces many interesting facts, a vast documentation of research materials unfamiliar to most of us (the bibliographical references are appallingly rangy), and some new insights.

It does not produce—the reader should be well-warned—a detailed history of structure and style in the colonial architecture of Connecticut. Approximately one-third of the book deals with English towns, villages, plantations, husbandry, and buildings in the seventeenth century; another third with Connecticut populations, town-sites, land subdivision and road-networks; and a final third with the houses and meeting-houses of early Connecticut. Except for an occasional reference, there is no at-

tempt to deal with the Georgian style of the eighteenth century: nary a bolection molding, Palladian window, or pilaster plagues us with its puzzling chronology. The latter chore has been done before, and this book is quite frankly concerned with the style of the seventeenth century, its English precedents, and its belated continuations in the eighteenth century.

Of particular interest to architectural historians is the author's attack on the "evolutionary concept" of plan-development in colonial houses: the one-room, two-room, added lean-to sequence familiar to all readers of Isham and Kelly. He demonstrates that this cannot be taken as a chronological evolution, that all these plan-types were familiar in England, and that all of them were doubtless brought over within the first generation of settlement. He perhaps underplays the fact that in individual houses, however, such growth-sequence did actually occur: single-room houses became two-room, and two-room houses received added lean-tos. Such accretions can be demonstrated easily in Massachusetts, because of superior documentation (the John Ward house in Salem went through all three stages), but instances also occurred in Connecticut. It was Kelly who contributed the misleading assumption that such a typological evolution could be stated in chronological terms. Few others, however—not even Isham, as the author points out in a footnote—adopted this hypothesis *in toto*, and the point is perhaps over-emphasized. Nonetheless it is well to have anchored down so clearly that choice of plan-type was a matter of economic and social status rather than date.

The reader is certain to discover a mine of "new" facts in this book. One of the most interesting is that New Haven was laid out with a regular plan of nine square blocks (the date is not specified, but one assumes 1638) and oriented according to the prescriptions of Vitruvius. The discovery of specifically classical influence in town-planning at so

early a date is important, and not less interesting is the author's method of discovery, which involved the variation of magnetic declination (to take the Army against the Navy on these terms) from 1638 to the present in resolving a seeming "error" of 6° 23'.

Another interesting disclosure is that the settlement of Connecticut (and probably Massachusetts as well) did not proceed so exclusively from southeastern England as has been generally supposed. The largest number of people came from that region, to be sure, but that was because it was most densely populated. The author shows that the number of settlers from each part of England bore an almost uniform proportion to the total populations of those parts in the early seventeenth century.

In general the book is most revealing in the three chapters dealing with Connecticut town-planning and its origins in England. The distinction between the nucleated agricultural village of the open-field type and the isolated farmhouse village which arose after the enclosure of fields, together with the associated differences in home-sites, field allotments, meetinghouse and common reserves, and the road networks, is clearly brought out, and is of particular interest in understanding the contrast between Connecticut towns of the seventeenth century and of the eighteenth century.

In the three chapters on architecture there are many new contributions to an already well-studied field, but also some dubia. The arguments of Shurtleff and Forman that the sixteen-foot "bay" of English agricultural buildings served as a standard module in laying out colonial houses has never seemed plausible to the reviewer, and Garvan's own dimensions do not seem to support the theory. It is necessary to break up the module into halves, thirds, and quarters, and to assume that "the point of departure for measurement varied in each case," in order to make the theory fit the facts.

This
explo
sym

The
ambig
dimen
was n
but on
hang
frame
the co
either
need f
It see
signed
ridgep
existed
was n
welcom
could
shingl
nectic
distinc
the se
the ga

But
any e
almost
is su
sevent
streng
uncove
that a
to mos
has E
volum
book
ciety o
and th
sents n
quality
search
future.

Mauri
tury
Goy
turic
pl.,

This seems reminiscent of the long-exploded ingenuities of the dynamic symmetrists.

The discussion of framing has some ambiguities. The upward increase in dimension of flared and shouldered posts was not visible on the outside, as stated, but on the inside; only the hewn overhang revealed a post externally. The framed or hewn overhang, Innocent to the contrary, can hardly be attributed, either in England or America, to the need for protecting wells against weather. It seems doubtful that framing was designed to "resist maximum thrust at the ridgepole," where no thrust at all existed, and where, in fact, there often was no ridgepole. It would have been welcome if answers to certain questions could have been given: how early were shingles used on outside walls in Connecticut? did the dormer-window, as distinct from the cross-gable, appear in the seventeenth century? how early did the gambrel roof appear in Connecticut?

But these are minor points, and in any event answers to all questions are almost impossible in a field where there is such a paucity of certainly-dated seventeenth-century buildings. The great strength of Garvan's book is that it has uncovered so much new information, and that a technique of research rather new to most American architectural historians has been so ably demonstrated. The volume was awarded a prize as the best book produced by a member of the Society of Architectural Historians in 1951, and there can be no doubt that it represents not only scholarship of outstanding quality, but exemplifies a method of research that promises to be fruitful in the future.

HUGH MORRISON
Dartmouth College

Maurice Raynal, *The Nineteenth Century: New Sources of Emotion from Goya to Gauguin (The Great Centuries of Painting)*, 148 pp., 69 color pl., Geneva: Skira, 1951. \$12.50.

It was my sorry task to review in a recent issue of this magazine a poorly put together book on French Impressionism. It is therefore doubly a pleasure to report on a most successful enterprise in the art of book-making and of book-writing. Another Skira volume: one has been prepared by previous volumes for fine reproductions, for a stimulating combination of picture and legend, and for pleasing typography. All this can be found in the present book. The reproductions are tipped to the page; in one instance the doubled pages unfold, in short, all the devices of the expensive magazine trade (*Fortune*, *American Fabrics*) are applied to a new shape of a book. With such emphasis on novelty, there arises the danger of another "de luxe" type, which tempts the buyer by make-up rather than by quality. Skira books, so far, by an intelligent choice of expert writers and by careful supervision of the set-up of every page, have avoided any of these pitfalls.

This new volume, too, is delightful as well as exciting by its selection of typical yet not always well-known examples. The quality of the reproductions is, in general, incomparably high, from which only the following must be exempted: p. 59, Delacroix (the green plate is insufficiently printed), p. 69, Daumier (too light and yellow, falsifying the original), p. 73, Courbet (too grey and mat), p. 73C, Courbet (unsharp overprinting), p. 99, Renoir (too grey), p. 102, Degas (too strongly printed, completely haywire). Six really poor reproductions out of 64 plates, this seems a fine record for the printers. On the other hand, where has one ever seen such a splendid double page of color, enhanced by the equality of sizes, as the two Goyas (p. 38/39) and the two Delacroix (p. 60/61) or the two Corots (p. 82/83)? One may question the use of details without the reproduction of the entire picture because this is to some extent misleading to the layman. In such instances might not the entire picture ap-

pear in a small reproduction? The choice of the pictures is nearly always convincing. Only in the case of Géricault one can not gain an idea of the artist from the reproduction of the single example of "Horse Held by Slaves." Non-French artists are thriftily dealt with in the reproductions: 5 Spanish (Goya), 4 English (Bonington, Constable, Turner), 2 American (Whistler, Ryder), 2 Dutch (Jongkind, Van Gogh), which makes 13 out of 64. Belgium, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, and Scandinavia are not represented. This takes away from the historical comprehensiveness of the volume, although it reflects the customary view.

The arrangement of the text is dramatically organized. It opens with an overture in which all the actors of the play are introduced on the stage. Now the reader knows where everyone will find his place. In five acts the play is performed, followed by a brief biographical section and good bibliographies of the main participants. While the book is too cursory for a true handbook of the 19th century, the reader certainly will have become curious for more information. This is mainly the merit of the excellent text and the legends written by Paul Raynal. His approach does not belong to the style of the present generation of "factualists." He is concerned with "style" and thus ranks with Roger Fry, Karl Scheffler and Julius Meyer-Graefe. His language has "esprit" yet is never purple, his argument is reasonable but never dry. The word "reasonable" is not chosen by accident. It appears as a favorite term of the author, often used where another writer might have said "instinctive." The discussions dwell little on the biographical side yet show true psychological insight where it is required. Descriptions of form are invariably flexible, individualized, to the point.

In proceeding it might be the best to follow the book in its own sequence with our comments.

To call Goya in one breath with

David "a fervent revolutionary" (p. 21) seems questionable. Goya changed his adherences, prompted often by his idiosyncracies. That he did "engravings" might be the translator's error (p. 40). David did not come from the "working class" (p. 24) but from the mercantile bourgeoisie. One page (30) is dedicated to the German Romantic School, unfortunately without a single reproduction. Kaulbach, an epigone of the Nazarene School, is given more space than the founders of the movement. Philipp Otto Runge, next to Friedrich, the greatest figure, is not even mentioned. A reproduction for Blake, a reproduction for Friedrich would have increased the aesthetic and the historical value of the book.

After the chapter of "Ingres and Space," one might expect to hear some more on the continuation of the classical and romantic traditions but there is no mention of Flandrin, Couture and Chassériau, and not even Puvis de Chavannes has made the grade. One looks in vain for the Pre-Raphaelites but finds them rather disconnected from the historical context under "Painting Outside of France in the Impressionist Period" (p. 123). These shortcomings are the result of a onesided preoccupation with the main current of 19th century, the naturalistic movement. Therefore a Bonington is honored by two fine pages of analysis (52/53) where a Hans van Marées, classical minded parallel to Cézanne in Germany, is lumped together with Feuerbach and Menzel (!) under the heading "Romantic Idealism."

The chapter on Géricault is inadequately illustrated and does not even mention his chef d'oeuvre or the portraits of insane people. Here the brilliance of Paul Raynal's writing becomes inconsequential because it does not provide the proper building stones for his judgments. In the case of Delacroix as in that of Manet, Raynal defies the customary pigeon-holing and emphasizes Delacroix' repudiation of being a

"Romantic" just as Manet never wanted to be an Impressionist. Altogether the sketch of Delacroix is truly brilliant.

Millet is characterized as a "nostalgic realist." Yet there is in this artist's design, as in that of Daumier, a Michael-angesque idealist element. The chapter on Corot is again deeply rewarding, as fine a piece of writing as ever has come to us since Roger Fry. Raynal rightly stresses the international effect of the Barbizon School but—in my opinion—underrates that of Courbet. In fact the statement that the latter had little effect in Germany except on Leibl is not correct (p. 122). The history of German naturalistic painting (with the exception of Menzel) is unthinkable without the deep impact of Courbet's work.

Whistler is, contrary to the "modern trend," honored by a whole chapter and an especially striking color reproduction of the "Golden Screen" (Freer Gallery, Washington). This might easily be the first European-written art history of the 19th century which dedicates a reproduction to Ryder. Even two American authors are honored by quotations: Sheldon Cheney, and to compensate, Helen Gardner.

Very rewarding are the critical evaluations of Jongkind and of Pissarro. Pissarro's letters are not quoted in the usually reliable bibliography and one has the feeling that Raynal perhaps has not read them. Otherwise he might have modified his judgments about Pissarro. Renoir, contrary to the general opinion, is discussed as a man of conflict, and, to some extent, of wavering judgment. Altogether he, like Manet, is seen from a

different and highly personal angle which forces one to rethink one's own opinions. On half a page (124) American art is discussed which is more than in most books written in Europe. Why some of the artists should be given with their dates and others not, is not quite understandable.

Chapter 5 has under its title a 10 line condensed statement about Post-Impressionism. It can serve as an example of the author's succinct thought.

The short biographies of the main figures are, as to be expected, well-written and informative with abbreviated bibliographies attached to them. A few mistakes and mis-spellings have crept in: Cézanne did not marry in 1866 since he had not yet met his future wife; Waldemann read Waldmann; Rumann read Ruemann. In the David biography one misses the important book by David Lloyd Dowd (1938) and in that of Toulouse-Lautrec the reliable biography of Gerstle Mack (1942). The condensed general bibliography at the last page is all one would wish for.

A word of thanks should go to James Emmons, the translator. His part is on a level with the elegant and intelligent style of the author.

While not truly a history of the 19th century, it is a book in which the French virtues of "raison" and "sensibilité" have joined into a harmonious creation. The book is the result of an enviable collaboration of the publisher, the layout artist and the author.

ALFRED NEUMEYER
Mills College

Books Received

America and the Mind of Europe. Introduction by Louis Galantieri; contributions by Raymond Aron, Denis de Rougemont, Arthur Koestler, Stephen Spender, Leo Lania, Melvin J. Laskey, Nicolas Nabokov, James T. Soby, Horace Sutton. 125 pp. New York: Literary Publishers, 1952. \$2.75.

Bage, Robert. *Hermesprong: or, Man, as He is Not.* 248 pp. New York: Library Publishers, 1951. \$3.75.

Baldass, Ludwig. *Van Eyck.* 104 pp., 86 ill., 170 pl. (8 in color). New York: Garden City Books, 1952. \$15.00.

Behrman, S. N. *Duveen.* 302 pp., 9 ill. by Saul Steinberg. New York: Random House, 1952. \$3.50.

Berger, Oscar. *My Victims.* 128 pp., many ill. New York: Harper Brothers, 1925. \$3.50.

Bowie, Henry P. *On the Laws of Japanese Painting.* 117 pp., 66 pl. New York: Dover, 1952. \$4.50.

Braun-Vogelstein, Julie. *Art, the Image of the West.* 245 pp., 65 ill. New York: Pantheon Books, 1952. \$4.50.

Bruno de Jesus Marie, O.C.D. *Satan.* 506 pp., 24 ill. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1952.

Chinese Ceramics: From the Prehistoric Period through Ch'ien Lung. Foreword by Jean Delacour. A Loan Exhibition from Collections in America and Japan. 120 pp., 381 ill. Los Angeles County Museum, March 14 to April 27, 1952.

Diehl, Gaston. *Vermeer.* Lucy Norton. 48 pp., 32 pl. (8 in color). New York: Macmillan. \$59.

Dobree, Bonamy. *Alexander Pope.* 125 pp. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. \$3.00.

Downs, Joseph. *American Furniture: Queen Anne and Chippendale Periods.* 36 pp., 401 ill. (9 in color). New York: Macmillan, 1952. \$17.50.

Dunlop, R. O. *How to Paint for Pleasure.* 143 pp., 12 ill., (4 in color). New York: Pellegrini and Cudahy, 1952. \$3.95.

The French Impressionists. 18 pp., 50 color pl. New York: Garden City Books. \$4.95.

Giedion, S. *A Decade of New Architecture.* 232 pp., 500 ill. Zurich: Verlag Girsberger. Fr. 32.

Goldscheider, Ludwig. *Towards Modern Art: or, King Solomon's Picture Book.* 98 ill. New York: Garden City Books, 1952. \$5.95.

Goodrich, Lloyd. *John Sloane.* 80 pp., many ill. New York: Macmillan, 1952. \$3.00.

Harrison, Elizabeth. *Self-Expression through Art.* 112 pp., 80 ill., 11 color pl. Peoria: Charles A. Bennett. \$4.00.

Lamont, Corliss. *Man Answers Death: An Anthology of Poetry.* 330 pp. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. \$4.50.

Lindsey, John. *Wren: His Works and Times.* 256 pp., 32 ill. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. \$6.00.

MacPartland, John. *The March toward Matter.* 80 pp. New York: Philosophical Library. \$2.75.

BOOKS RECEIVED

319

- Maurello, S. Ralph. *Commercial Art Techniques*. 126 pp., over 500 ill. New York: Tudor Publishing Co. \$3.00 cloth; \$1.00 paper.
- Mauriac, Francois. *The Stumbling Block*. 83 pp. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952.
- McCausland, Elizabeth. A. H. Maurer: *A Biography of America's First Modern Painter*. 289 pp., 65 ill. New York: A. A. Wyn, 1951. \$5.00.
- McInnes, Graham. *Canadian Art*. 140 pp., 38 ill. New York: Macmillan, 1952. \$5.00.
- Moranz, John. *The Professional Guide to Drawing and Illustration*. 400 pp., 1150 ill. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1952. \$4.95.
- Morrison, Hugh. *Early American Architecture*. 619 pp., 484 ill. New York: Oxford University Press, 1952. \$12.50.
- Mundt, Ernest. *A Primer of Visual Art*. 42 pp., 92 ill. (8 in color). New York: Pellegrini and Cudahy, 1952. \$3.00.
- Nettl, Paul. *Forgotten Musicians*. 352 pp. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. \$4.75.
- Ott, Richard. *The Art of Children*. 5 pp., 6 ill., 25 pl. (17 in color). New York: Pantheon Books, 1952. \$6.50.
- Pearson, Ralph M. *The Modern Renaissance in the U.S.A.* (Critical Appreciation Course, II.) 160 pp., 207 ill. Nyack, N.Y.: Ralph M. Pearson's Design Workshop, n.d. \$5.00.
- Pellotier, Jean. *Delacroix*. Tr. Lucy Norton. 48 pp., 38 pl. (8 in color). New York: Macmillan, 1952. \$.59.
- Philippe-Lucet, A. *Rubens*. Tr. Anthony Page. 48 pp., 39 ill. (8 in color). New York: Macmillan, 1952. \$.59.
- Powys, John Cowper. *Porius: A Romance of the Dark Ages*. 682 pp., New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. \$5.75.
- Les Primatifs Flamands*, vol. I, part 1: *Le Musée Communal de Bruges*, by A. Janssens de Bisthoven and R. A. Parmentier. 73 pp., 234 ill. (3 in color). Anvers: De Sikkel, 1951. Bg. frs. 420, paper covers; 480, bound; 520, with separate pl.
- Rader, Melvin, ed. *A Modern Book of Esthetics: An Anthology*. Revised Edition. xxxviii +. 602 pp. New York: Henry Holt, 1952. \$4.85.
- Rilke, Rainer Maria. *His Last Friendship*. 115 pp. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. \$2.75.
- Rilke, Rainer Maria. *The Life of the Virgin Mary*. 49 pp. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. \$2.75.
- Russell, Bertrand. *Dictionary of Mind, Matter and Morals*. 290 pp. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. \$5.00.
- Shaw, Theodore L. *War on Critics*. 208 pp. Boston: Stuart Art Gallery. \$3.50.
- Singer, Eric. *The Graphologist's Alphabet*. 117 pp., many ill. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. \$3.75.
- Taillander, Yvon. *Giotto*. Tr. Lucy Norton. 48 pp., 35 ill. (7 in color). New York: Macmillan, 1952. \$.59.
- Trapier, Elizabeth du Gue. *Ribera*. xiv + 306 pp., 177 ill. New York: Hispanic Society of America, 1952. \$9.00.
- Updike, Daniel Berkeley. *Printing Types: Their History, Forms and Use*. Vol. I, 292 pp., 192 ill.; Vol. II, 326 pp., 367 ill. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951. \$12.50.
- Valsecchi, Marco, and Apollonio, Umbro. *Panorama dell' Arte italiana*. 502 pp., many ill. Torino: Editori Lattes. 1951. L. 3000.

Van Heerikhuizen, F. W. *Rainer Maria Rilke: His Life and Work*. 396 pp. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. \$6.00.

Wales, Nym. *Fables and Parables*. 339 pp. 2 ill. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. \$4.75.

Watson, Dudley C. *The Art of Eugene and Elizabeth Kormendi*. 21 pp. of plates. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. \$2.50.

Warbeke, John M. *The Power of Art*. 493 pp. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. \$6.00.

Williams, Gardner. *Humanistic Ethics*. 221 pp. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. \$3.75.

Williams, Henry Horace. *Logic for Living*, ed. Jane Ross Hammer. 280 pp. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. \$3.75.

Wingert, Paul S. *Prehistoric Stone Sculpture of the Pacific Northwest*. 34 pp., 42 ill. Portland: Portland Art Museum, 1952.

Zentralinstitut für Kunstgeschichte in München: *Jahresbericht, 1950-1951*. 16 pp. München: Zentralinstitut, 1951.

NEWS REPORTS

(Continued from page 295)

versity on April 24-26, 1952. Lectures and panel discussions were held on various problems of Medieval and Renaissance art as well as the teaching of design by conference members.

The 1953 meeting will be held at the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa. The following officers were elected for the coming year: President, Manuel Bromberg, School of Design, North Carolina State College, Raleigh, North Carolina; Vice President, Richard B. Freeman, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama; and Secretary-Treasurer, Dawn S. Kennedy, Alabama College, Montevallo, Alabama.

THE MATCHETTE FOUNDATION PRIZE IN AESTHETICS

An award of five hundred dollars will be given for the best article in aesthetics or the philosophy of art by an American author during the academic year 1952-53.

This award is offered by the Franklin J. Matchette Foundation of 20 East 66th Street, New York City, through its Director, Mr. William H. Matchette, and its Board of Trustees. Articles are to be sent to Dr. Thomas Munro, Editor of the *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, at The Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland 6, Ohio. They must arrive by May 1, 1953. Each article should be accompanied by a large, self-addressed envelope with sufficient postage for return.

Conditions stated by the Foundation are that the article shall be preferably, but not necessarily, based on the Absolute-Relative Theory; and that the editorial staff of the *Journal of Aesthetics* is to publicize and judge the award. The award is not limited to articles published in the *Journal of Aesthetics*, but the winning article shall be so published. "An American author" will be understood to mean an author who is an American citizen or one who is a resident and has secured his first papers of naturalization.

N.B.

Index to Volume II to be found in Volume
no. 1.

THE BURLINGTON MAGAZINE

AN INTERNATIONAL MAGAZINE
FOR CONNOISSEURS



FOUNDED IN 1903

The World's Leading Art Journal

THE BURLINGTON MAGAZINE is indispensable to all seriously interested in art. It deals with all forms of art, both ancient and modern, and thus appeals equally to the student and to the collector.

Its contributors are the foremost art scholars in the world. The size and quality of its illustrations are unsurpassed. For nearly fifty years it has held its position as the most important and comprehensive art journal published.

THE SUBJECTS INCLUDE: Unpublished and newly discovered Old Masters, including both paintings and drawings, ancient textiles, china, furniture, metalwork and every variety of antique of interest to the collector or student of art.

Illustrated. Published monthly, 5s. U.S.A. \$1.00
Annual Subscription, £3. U.S.A. \$10.00
post free.

THE BURLINGTON MAGAZINE, LTD.
12, BEDFORD SQUARE, LONDON, W. C. 1

C

A

COLLEGE ART JOURNAL

J

